

# Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara

BY

J S SPEYER

Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam

FIFTH FIFTEENTH SERIES,

NEW SERIES

Deel VIII N°. 5

W

AMSTERDAM

JOHANNIS MÜLLER

# Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara

BY

J S SPEYER

---

Verhandelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam,

AFDEELING I ETTERKUNDE.

NIUFDE REEKS

Deel VIII N<sup>o</sup> 6.

AMSTERDAM,  
JOHANNES MÜLLER

# CONTENTS.

	Pages
Introductory Chapter	1—8

## SECTION THE FIRST

### *Brhatkatha and Kallasaritsagara*

Chapter I	The Brhatkathamangala	9
Chapter II	The Brhatkatha Its contents	27
Chapter III	The Brhatkatha Its date and its author	41

## SECTION II

### *The Text of the Kallasaritsagara*

Chapter I	The two editions	61
§ 1	General comparison of the editions of Brockhaus and of Durgaprasad	61
§ 2	Errors and mistakes in Brockhaus' edition	67
§ 3	Corrections of Kathas' words and expressions to be made in the Petropokitan Dictionary	76
§ 4	Grammatical monstra removed	87
§ 5	D's edition not a critical edition	91
Chapter II	List of passages the text of which has been improved in Durgaprasad's edition	94
Chapter III	Conjectural criticism	104
Chapter IV	Metronum con pectus	174

## INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

---

In days of yore when Çiva the Lord of the Universe was alone with his beloved wife the daughter of Himavanti, and addressed her she asked him to tell her some charming new tale for Indian gods and goddesses are as fond of tales as Indian men and women. The Supreme God however reluctantly and after an unsuccessful expedient to acquit himself with little entered upon a story of immense length and of an extraordinary charm. Püvati wishing to keep the whole of the pleasure to be procured by that wonderful extent of tales to herself shut the door and ordered Nandin Çiva's bull to withhold any person whatsoever from coming in. In the meanwhile one of Çiva's most beloved Ganas Puspikanti his name went on to see his master. Being forbidden the entrance he succeeded by dint of magic power to penetrate unseen within the presence of Çiva and Püvati and to overhear that new and delightful story about the seven sovereigns of the Air spirits (Vidyadharas). Full as he was of the great tale he had heard he afterwards narrated it to his own wife Jivati for who can hide wealth or a secret from women? She again told it over to her mistress the wife of Çiva for how can women be expected to restrain their speech? So it happened that Püvati knew the disclosure of the Great Narration notwithstanding the precautions taken to keep it secret and in her wrath she caused the indiscreet Gani to be born as a man. Mahavanti another Gani, who interceded for his guilty friend was in a similar manner damned to a human existence. She fixed however a limit to the punishment. When you, Puspikanti will meet in the forest with a Piquet whose name is Kumbhanti and who is properly a Yaksa brought to the state of Piquet by a curse of Kubera you will remember the whole tale then you must narrate it to

him, after which you shall be released. As to Mahavrat, he shall get free from the curse after hearing the tale from Kānabhuti'. Accordingly both fell down from on high and were born in the world of men. And having spent their lives with various things, they fulfilled it last and after many vicissitudes the conditions prescribed to them and so regained the upper regions and their former state. But Mahavrat or rather Guṇadhara — for that was his name on earth and in his human existence — having heard the tale as it was narrated to him by Kānabhuti could not recover his original state before he had written it down and proclaimed it. Now, since the language in which it had been communicated to him was the vulgar and despised Pāṣṇī tongue, Kānabhuti being a Prier and since himself was prohibited to translate it into some nobler dialect restrained as he was by a vow from the use of Sanskrit, Prakrit and either Apabhraṃśa or the conversational language of the country (*dhī*)<sup>1</sup>, six-sevenths of the wondrous narration were lost from want of human audience to catch the tale and keep it. He had no other listeners than the forest animals and the trees on which being he spent his recital, burning each leaf of the text after proclaiming. Finally King Śatavahana whose minister Guṇadhara had formerly been, being requested to lay hold on the tale went up to him and preserved the rest for mankind even this a poem of considerable size, as it extended over 100 000 śloka.

This is the marvellous origin of that rich and splendid storehouse of manifold stories preserved to us in a Sanskrit redaction the Kathasaritsagara as is narrated in its first book, The Scope of the Tale. Somadeva the Kīrtanmukha court poet to whom we are indebted for that largest and most interesting collection of tales is with due right considered one of the most illustrious Indian poets. And for my part I dare say that he is one of the few Indian literary geniuses who by their relative simplicity of language their moderation in the employment of rhetorical requisites their aiming at clearness and appropriateness of style their knowledge of human nature and their art of arranging the plot of a tale may stand out the judgment of European critics according to the standard of Occidental literature. Though he lived as late as the second part of the eleventh century I do not hesitate to

make him rank with the greatest Sanskrit authors and to place his *Encyclopedia of tales* (for so his 'Ocean of the Streams of Story' is characterized the best) as a classical work next to the lyric poems and dramatic writings of Kālidāsa. His language charms by its purity and the proper choice of words, his style by its plumpness and elegance. His metrical skill is great and is fully displayed by the number and variety of the different metres which he handles with ease and without the slightest embarrassment.

Apart from the beautiful form of the poem its contents are of great interest. This store-house of tales may have been built at a comparatively recent time: the very eve of the Mohammedan conquest; the stories and legends gathered up in it are old ones. The *Bṛhat Katha* its source preceded it by many centuries. And this older collection must also have been made up out of traditional materials. It is a matter of fact that some smaller collections, as the *Purāṇa-tāntṛa* and the *Vetārapurāṇa*, are incorporated into it now and then the reader meets with some mythological narration from the Vedic age<sup>1)</sup> or with celebrated epic and purāṇic stories, as that of Cibi and the dove (tir 7 85—97) of Ruru and the water-snake (tir 11 76—87) of Sunda and Iṇṇasunda (tir 15, 135—140) of the birth of Śaṃṣa (tir 21 60 foll.) of the death of Pṛmḍa (tir 21 20—27) the love-story of Uśa and Anuruddha (tir 31 11—33) and the extensive relation of the tale of Nala and Damayanti (36 238—417). In other portions of the book legends of the Buddhists are often reproduced especially in *lambāṇa* VI. The main story however and a large number of the episodes are Śaiva tales as was to be expected from the supposed first narrator being no other than the Supreme God Śiva himself. From this we may infer that the original collection, the *Bṛhat Katha*, must have been arranged in that period of Indian history when Buddhism exercised its sway over the Hindoo mind side by side with Śaivism and so many other manifold varieties of sectarian and local creeds, rites and theosophies.

Moreover Śaivadeva wiled himself of the opportunities afforded by the richness and the many-sidedness of his subject-matter to represent as in a mirror the different shades and aspects of multifarious Indian society, its huge towns, the seats of commerce and learning as well as the wild tracks of its forest regions inhabited by ferocious and uncivilized tribes, as described in the vivid picture in tir 102,

<sup>1)</sup> As it is a love-making with Alakṣī (17, 137—147), his beguiling of Vāmeśvara (216—219), the latter tale however is dressed in a Buddhist garb.

56 foll. In this respect the Kathasaritsagara — besides its being an arsenal of more or less ancient tales of great value for the comparative study of fancy and folklore and for the transmigration of fables and novels — depicts also to the student of the Indian world the image of mediæval Indian society, its customs and its worldlings its every day life and its feasts its ruling classes and its scum.

Nevertheless only few of the tales are of the pure novelistic kind. Such stories as that of the impostors Civa and Madhava, who played a foul trick to a wealthy purohita (21-52—200) and of the *jala* and *Ala* tricks (57, 51—175) which are wholly free from the supernatural beings and things so habitual to works of Indian fancy are seldom met with. In the great bulk of the tales there is large room for deities and spirits of the most various kinds and for secret and invisible powers of holy men or sorcerers influencing the course of the facts. In short the Kathasaritsagara is an emblem of fairy tales. Devas Asuras Nagas Yaksa Raksumsi etc. but most of all the Vidadhivas abound in them. the magic arts the intuitive omniscience obtained by men possessing marvellous powers their flying through the air and commanding of spirits their transformation of men into animals and insects the hideous occult rites of magicians and witches as well as divine intercession and divine protection are dealt with as if they were the most natural things in the world. Somadeva who was a well educated man and possessed a keen intellect and an original wit as sufficiently appears from many an incidental utterance and general remark with which he likes to intersperse his narrative <sup>1</sup>) succeeded very well in keeping undisturbedly from the beginning to the end of his long poem that style of epic ingenuities which affords a so great charm to that kind of writings. Now and then he reminds of Ovid by some humorous turn but he was not so superficial as the author of the *Metamorphoseon libri*. He composed his great work for the amusement of the old queen his patroness the wife of king Harsa of Kāluçia <sup>2</sup>) It is hardly necessary to add that his belief in the reality of those numerous tales however be it with god and spirits of high regard in the creed of the Indian people cannot have been much greater than ours <sup>1</sup>

As I have stated above Gunadhara is the reputed author of the

<sup>1</sup>) W. 11 p. 16. "We may here observe once for all that the stories of the Kathasaritsagara are constantly interspersed with the maximum of sentimentality."

<sup>2</sup>) It is hardly necessary to add that his belief in the reality of those numerous tales however be it with god and spirits of high regard in the creed of the Indian people cannot have been much greater than ours <sup>1</sup>

Great Tale But his authorship cannot of course be extended to the first of the eighteen *cantos* or *lambakas* of which it is made up The first lambika treats of the origin of the Great Tale and how it was made known on earth It is King Satyadhara who is credited for this After having got the Tale says Somadeva Satyadhara went to compose the Kathapitha [so is the name of lambika I] in the same tongue [viz the Prakrit dialect] (in 8 37 1)

The plan of the work is conformable to Indian habits of story telling It consists of a frame tale in which a large number of various other tales are stored up by the way of episodes Sometimes the episodic narration may be itself a new frame tale with respect to other stories Some books as the V<sup>th</sup> one is a whole inserted into the main story This design is executed with greater or lesser skill Upon the whole the art of enclaving is not so well executed in the latter books, where some old famous collections of tales as the Pancatantra the adventures of Meghadatta and his ten companions, the Vetulapancavanti are embodied in full the last lambika the story of Visvamata the vanquisher of the barbarians looks as if it were a latter addition to a ready made work

The frame tale is concerned with the *facts et gestes* of Nandadhara datta who was the son of Udayana king of Vatsa and at the same time the new embodiment of Kunt who had become Ananga (bodiless) by the fire of the wrath of Civa Born as the son of a human King, he reached by degrees the high and heavenly state of a Calavartin of the Aury Spirits the Vidyadhara I and II and III are preparatory books They treat of his forefathers and more especially of his father the merry Udayana King of Vatsa the musical prince who is mentioned in Pancatantra by the name of Visvatas a well known figure both in Indian *belles lettres* and in the Buddhist records where he ranks among the kings contemporary with Çakya (Rhys Davids *Buddhist India* p 3 foll) It is related by what confidence he got the love and the hand of Visvadhara who was to become Nandadhara's mother daughter to the Ujjain King Candamara and in what way he succeeded to obtain for his second wife Padmavati daughter of the mighty Magadha king finally how his great chief minister Sangandharadatta made him acquire the sovereignty over the earth

) Here I differ from Tawney's translation while it is *ajānta rakṣaṁ cakre* is rendered "so p. el the book on el Kathapitha in order to show how the tale came to be first made known in the Prakrit to give The instrum is to be construed with rakṣa not with a nāra



In lambaka IV Naravāhana's birth is told and the predictions of his future greatness.

Lambaka VI, which contains many and various pleasing stories taken for a great deal from Buddhistic sources, is devoted to the history of Kalugāsenī whose daughter is destined to become Naravāhanadatta's first queen. She loved Udayana, but could not be married to him. Some Vidyādharā made her his wife by surprise, assuming the figure of that king. As the son of Udayana is an avatar of Kṛṣṇa, so it is Rati herself who is embodied into the daughter of Kalugāsenī.<sup>1)</sup> Therefore, it is a matter of course that the two royal children become in due time husband and wife.

At this point of the tale, the main story begins to lose its interest. Udayana, the joyous monarch of the *dhīra lalita* type (see LAVIS *Théâtre indien*, p. 64) is evidently a popular hero of old local legend.<sup>2)</sup> He is a man of action and his performances are manifold. He and his ministers and comrades Vāṅmadhavan, the wise plotter and strenuous executor of political schemes, Ruciravant the victorious commander of his armies, and Vasantaka the companion of his pleasures and the solace in his adversity are typical characters with individual features belonging to popular tradition. But Naravāhanadatta, his ministers and the endless series of his wives, the obtaining of whom is the chief subject of the other lambakas and the main object of his exploits do not possess that stamp of people bred origin. They are rather the result of the mechanically elaborated reproduction of the fixed type of the Cakravartin and his court projected in *Itanvī* and *Alvars* the like meetings of the son of Udayana with heavenly women who are destined to become his wives, always the same or nearly the same course of events, leading to the happy union with those princesses in whose supernatural powers he gets gradually initiated being in this way accustomed to take his residence among the Vidyādhars and becoming capable to conquer at last the Sovereignty in that Nephelokokkijira among the snowclad heights of holy Kailāsa. This series of similar feats and adventures, in performing which our hero like another Vāṅman Acneers, plays a

<sup>1)</sup> Or rather she was thought so by every one. The real child of Kalugāsenā was a son whom Prajāpati however according to the order of (śiva exchange) for a girl of supernatural birth (as a girl) who was no other than Rati. See Kathās 131 43-46 t 110, 71. The real child Rati was conceived to live after the Vidyādhara, who brought him up.

<sup>2)</sup> With one exception. In 131 n. 2 aṅgīraṇa tes tina 31 st e Me lādūta 1 aṅgīraṇa 1 la jana lādūta aṅgīraṇa aṅgīraṇa.

somewhat passive part as he is throughout directed by the protecting hand of deities and even by Çiva himself, would be very monotonous, if it stood alone. But just here the frame story mostly recedes behind the numerous and diversified incidental stories so that the monotony of the so called main tale dwindles away in the background. Book XIV—XVI contain the triumph of the hero, the narrative of his wars and heroic performances by which he won that sovereignty of the Vidyadhars long promised to him. He was, however not the first among mortals to reach that paramount power in the regions bordering on Çiva's precincts others before him had come to it. Two entire books, the V<sup>th</sup> and the VIII<sup>th</sup> are filled with the narrative of the exploits of two predecessors the former Lumbika is a small fairy tale in itself of no little charm the latter miles up a terrible epic poem, celebrating the glory of the Asuris when victorious over the Devas.

H. H. Wilson was the first European scholar, who drew the attention of Occidental learning to this Storehouse of fables. In an introductory article in the *Oriental Quarterly Magazine* (March 1821, p. 63—77) and continuing his communications in the following numbers of that periodical he gave a summary of the contents of Lumbika I—V.<sup>1)</sup> It was professor BROCKHAUS who undertook the first edition of the *Kathasansigana*. Its first part appeared as early as 1839 it contains the same five Lumbikas which had been told over by Wilson. More than twenty five years elapsed before he succeeded to get out the rest of the work. Lumbika VI—VIII appeared in 1862 the remainder being by far the greater portion of the whole — 12589 slokas against 8799 contained in the first and second parts — was edited in 1860, both publications making part of the *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* and printed with Roman types whereas the first volume Lumb. I—V had been edited in native types. The text of Brockhaus remained for a long time the work of reference for the *Kathasansigana* but its authority is now superseded by the edition of DECEAISEAN, printed at the Annamigana press (1<sup>st</sup> impression 1889 second impn 1903) which has been executed in a laudable manner, as will be shown in Chapter I § 1 of Section II of this treatise.

An excellent translation of the work appeared in 1880—1884

<sup>1)</sup> These papers are reprinted in WILSON'S *Papers collected and edited by F. B. P. ROSE* in 1864. They are found in the first Volume (= Vol. III of Wilson's Works) p. 156—263.

in the *Bibliotheca Indica* Mr C H TAWNEY, to whom we are indebted for it acquitted himself of the self-imposed duty of rendering into English a work of that extent and of so high intrinsic merits in a very satisfactory manner. He has well provided those who without acquaintance with Sanskrit for their studies in folklore and comparative history of literature want to draw the Indian parallels or prototypes from their genuine source.

I for my part do not enter here upon the comparison of the numberless tales told in our Ocean of Streams of Tale. The present investigations do not go beyond the limits of Indology. They wholly belong to the field of critical and philological research. I have divided them into two sections. The former of them is devoted to the question pertaining to the *Bṛhatkatha*; in the second section the differences of the text in the two editions of the *Kathasarit-sa-gara* and some points of criticism are dealt with.

---

# SECTION I

## BHĀVĀKATHĀ AND KATHĀSARISĀGARĀ

### CHAPTER I

#### THE BHĀVĀKATHAMĀÑJARI

As Somadeva explicitly affirms, his great storehouse of tales and stories of all kind is not a composition of his own invention nor is it a compilation from various sources but a Sanskritization of an older and more extensive poem written in a vulgar dialect. He says in the introductory verses of his work that it is the reproduction in a condensed shape of the *Bhāvakathā* the fabulous origin of which is narrated in its particulars in his first *lambaka*, the *Kāthapūthā*. He has nothing added to its contents nor has he omitted anything *yathā mūlam tathā mātān na manau apy atikramah* (t. 1. 10) he has only abridged it and made a Sanskrit poem of it *grāntāṣṭāśārasamśepamūtrām bhūṣa ca bhūṣate* 1), taking care besides to embellish his epitome with the indispensable adornments required in a *kāvya* yet in this going only as far as was compatible with his main purpose to keep intact the relish of the tales narrated in the old poem 2). So he had the right to style his work a *Bhāvakathāsarasāṅgraha* (Summary of the quintessence of *Bhāvakathā*) as he does in the beginning of his poem t. 1. 3 *Bhāvakathāyāḥ sarasya saṅgraham racayamy aham*, and in one of the concluding verses which we find in the ed. of Brockhaus but not found in that of Durgaprasād, p. 597, cl. 12

*n mahākathāmītamayasya Bhāvakathāyāḥ  
sarasya saṅgamaṇamānandhijīvanānandhah  
Somaśa viparābhurīqunabhūma-  
Rāṣṭrajena vīṭah klala saṅgrāhaḥ 'gaur*

1) I quote this line, as it is cited in Durgaprasād's edition. The alt. red. text of Brockhaus *bhāva ca utpate* may further be left aside. Nor is it clear we can say to take here *utpate* = Sanskrit in the line in question of the work as Hall did (see footnote to edition of Salinas 1884 p. 124 n.) in his edition of the work and erroneous translation of the line by Brockhaus.

2) More about this *śloka* see below, p. 11 f. 11

Now as long as no other testimony was known, that is, until 1859 very distinguished scholars did believe the real existence of such a voluminous work in a Prākrit dialect, as the Brhatkathā was claimed for. Could the Kashmiri composer of the Kathasarit-sagara not have fancied that origin of his work which by itself is an encyclopaedia of products of fancy? Must his statement be taken *à la lettre*? A statement moreover, susceptible to find little credit also on the ground that the tale narrated about the reputed author of that famous Brhatkathā himself Gunadhara is full of unhistorical matter and miraculous incidents in short a mere fairy tale. The first editor of the Kathasarit-sagara went even so far in the way of mistrust that in the Preface of the first volume of his edition which was published in 1839 he explained the distinct avowal of Somadeva about the abstruse of his poem in a sense diametrically opposed to the words he pretended to comment upon.

Sein Verdienst beruht wohl hauptsächlich in der gleichmässig stilistischen Redaction des früher unter mancherlei Formen in Prosa und Versen Zerstreuten. In the subsequent volumes which appeared in 1866 and 1868 he did not repeat that view.

Yet he might have learned as early as 1859 that Somadeva's statement about the Brhatkathā had been corroborated by other evidence. In that year Fitz Edward Hall in the Preface to his edition of Subandhu's romance in prose Vivaraditti, drew the attention to the fact unobserved before that such high authorities as Dandin in his Kāvya-darśana Bana in his Harivamśa, and already Subandhu himself prior to Bana knew and prized the great Prākrit poem of Gunadhara and that according to the manner in which they refer to it we may feel convinced that it enjoyed a great popularity in their time. A passage in Subandhu's romance contains even an allusion to a story told in the Brhatkathā which is actually found in our Kathasarit-sagara P. 110 *asti Brhatkathā laṅkāyā na c' śālabhāṅkopetaiḥ vā śālabhāṅga obhitaḥ* Kusu-may-rani Subandhu comparing the honours of Pātaliputra adorned with columns bearing the shape of human figures (*śālabhāṅga*) to the canto of the Brhatkathā in which *śālabhāṅga* is likewise met with alludes to the story of the gambler Dhantikaṇḍa and his beloved Kalyāṇī the Aparādhī who was changed by Indra's curse into a pillu-stripte (*śālabhāṅga*) but recovered her proper form by the cunning of her lover (Kathā 121 72—186)<sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Hall II p. 90 writing in his Preface at a time when only five of the eighteen labakas of Kathasarit-sagara had been published errs in the interpretation of *śālabhāṅga* as

In 1871, A. C. BURNELL, in a letter to *The Academy*, written at Tanjore July 21 and printed in the number of 15 Sept of that periodical, brought to notice that he had discovered a MS of another Sanskrit redaction of the Bihatkathā different from that of Somadeva. This turns out he wrote, to be almost identical in matter with the Kathasaritsagara. The tales are almost the same even in the names the arrangement (as far as I have been able to examine the MSS) is much the same but the style is not so good. The tales are told in a very bald way and shorter than in the K S S though here and there one finds long and tedious descriptions. This first hint was followed in the next year by the masterly article of G. BURNELL in the First Volume of the *Indian Antiquary* (p 302 foll) in this he gave an account of another MS of the same work the Bihatkathāmanjari of Ksemendra which he had acquired for the Government of Bombay. He established the two important facts 1<sup>st</sup> that both Somadeva and Ksemendra worked on the same text 2<sup>nd</sup> that they composed their poems independently from one another. From some discrepancies in the names for the rest common to both he drew arguments to prove the correctness of the statement of both abbreviators as to the original Bihatkathā being composed in Pūrcī. His judgment about the character of the poem of Ksemendra agreed with that of Burnell. His brevity makes him unintelligible and his style is far from being easy and flowing (I l p 306). After comparing with each other the story of Putrikā as told by Somadeva in the 3 of the Kathas and by Ksemendra in the 2<sup>d</sup> gucchā of his lambikā I he concludes thus:

I could easily add a dozen other instances where particulars given in the Kathasaritsagara are limited at but not helped in the Bihatkathā (I l p 308) (p also his *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS* (1877) p 17).

In order to demonstrate his views Bühler had published in the paper quoted a few passages from the first lambikā of the Bihatkathāmanjari especially the story of Upalokā. It was not till 1881 that other portions were put under the press. S. LEVI edited the first lambikā (or lambhikā) 1<sup>st</sup> in full in the *Journal Asiatique* of Nov—Dec of that year and in a subsequent article in the number of Feb—Apr 1886 also the first and second Vaidī

) Both spellings are found it seems in the manuscript Bühler II p 307 n 1 quotes from fol 319 a c of the MS *the Bhakāmanjari* ep Levi J As (1881) p 10 but cf Burnell p 311 *the Bhakāmanjari* I l p 306 supra I l 10 the passage of Subhūti dealing with *Bhaktāmanjari* I l apparently the name of the sections of the original is *Bhaktāmanjari*.

tale. He used for that purpose both MSS then available in Europe that required by Bühler (B) and a copy of that which Burnell had detected (A) for the Vedic tales he added himself also of a third MS, likewise required by Bühler and belonging to the Poona library (C)<sup>1)</sup>, which does not contain the first Ambaka. By the bye, it may be noted that none of these MSS has the complete text. L. von Mankowski who published the Pāṇcatantra portion of *Bhikṣukāthamāṇjari* in 1892<sup>2)</sup> had but one MS. I take B to make use of, this portion being wanting both in A and C<sup>3)</sup>.

By this additional number of slokas — 308 — published for the first time by Mankowski, the proportion of the printed portion of the *Bhikṣukāthamāṇjari* to that not yet printed was brought up to almost 1 : 10<sup>1/2</sup>.

In the meanwhile several more MSS have been discovered. VILCHER in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* registers 4 in the first, 3 in the second and 2 in the third volume *sub voce* *Bhikṣukāthamāṇjari* besides 2 others that consist of smaller fragments (as one mentioned in Part III which contains only the Vedic portion) among them are also the copies which Burnell had caused to be taken of A. Besides he mentions in Part I, 2 MSS *sub titulo* *Bhikṣukāthi* one of which is his *Kāṭin* 7 the other is one of the pastime that belonged to the pandit Rudhākṣara of Lahore. Probably the 6 notices refer to the work of Kṣemendri<sup>4)</sup>.

Finally, in 1901 the whole work has been printed at the Varanasi Press. The title page names Mahādhīpādhyakṣa Pandit Chandra and Kṛishṇa Pindurang Puri as editors. There is no preface at all nor is there given any account of the MSS that are the basis for the constitution of the text. From the short and scanty critical footnotes we are allowed to infer that the editors had two manuscripts at their disposition one denoted 𑀓 and the other 𑀔 each of them full of gaps and corruptions but together they make up almost the complete poem. Neither of them may be identified with C or some copy of C since the first Ambaka is wanting in neither. The MS 𑀔 is either = B

or very close to it. It seems to be different from both A and B. The Nanyang Press must have possessed one of them in 1888 for on the first page of its edition of the *Kathasaritagara* foot note 3 contains an information about *asmadyan Brattathana jar pustalan* of which it is said that it is *acudhan, paravale kaval titatan asti*. The second must have been acquired between 1888 and 1901.

The edition itself (Kavyamala 69) exhibits a disadvantageous contrast to the valuable edition of *Kathasaritagara* printed at the same Nanyang Press. The wretched condition of the MSS available does not afford a sufficient excuse for the bad workmanship of those who carried out the edition princeps of a so highly important text. They discharged themselves of their task carelessly and hastily and did not avail themselves of the ready at hand instruments for correcting obvious misreadings in their manuscripts. In 1871 Buhler could not know that the father of Ksemendra was named Pilaendra when he edited *Ind Ant* I 307 n 2. *Pratiscandibhaddo bhavati* he reproduced the reading of his MS the rights of which he was not able to control at that time. But the two Pandits editing in 1901 a work of Ksemendra should not have kept that corrupted reading in their text (see p 619 cl 31 and esp eg p 161 cl 2 of the *Digvijayavamsa* edited in 1891 at the same Nanyang Press by the same Krimath and his father Dingirasa). A close comparison with the parallel passages in *Kathas* being a valuable help, yet almost indispensable for any one who had undertaken the task of a critical edition worthy of the Kavyamala series, they show but very rarely that they did so as a rule they either neglected that useful and easy cross-examination or did so in a superficial manner. To leave aside their neglect or ignorance of the readings published by Buhler I can mention in the portions edited previously 1) they failed sometimes to realize the incoherent and perturbed condition of the text of their manuscripts. Thus XIV p 491 cl 309 they were not aware that the former line is a ditto-graphy of cl 308a. — In Ambala IX p 271—277 the story of Gudarava is rendered wholly unintelligible, owing to the fact that two different portions of it are intermixed. Remove cl 740b—761 from their place and insert them between 728 and 729 all will be put

1) Thinking it may be profitable to the perusers of the edition of Brikm to have at hand the better readings of those European scholars for correcting the bad ones of their printed text I have put them together in an appendix annexed to this chapter.



right and the concord with the parallel passage in Kathīs (73, 305—359) will be restored — Another instance of the same lack of attention P 102 and 403 of their edition in the same lambaka IX the 3<sup>d</sup> gucchā (śl 1—10) opens with the continuation of the adventures of Mrgakṣattā at the point when Viṅghraśena finishes his relation of the events which had happened to himself and his comrades whereupon Mrgakṣattā sets out for Ujjayinī, these matters are told in Kathi for 101 and 102 But at śl 11 we are on a sudden transported into the story of Keśitā and Kandarapā a quite different tale which is found in Kathis for 123 From śl 11 to 64 the narration of Ksemendra corresponds to Kathis 123 203—230 But at śl 64 lo we are back again as suddenly as we left them before to the gallant Mrgakṣattā and his faithful followers What has happened? That portion of the story of Keśitā which disturbs in that singular manner the regular course of the Mrgakṣattā-tāthā was by some accident or other gone astray and had been put into the wrong place By transporting it to p 430 in lambaka X and filling up with it the large gap which the editors signalize on that page after śl 211 the due order will be restored — In lamb XIV the ślokas 401, 402 and 407 have been put into a wrong place they ought to be transposed after śl 394

Upon the whole I conclude the so called edition of the Brhat kathāmañjarī scatters with errors of print and of other kind

But even so we receive that editio princeps thankfully Now at least that important poem is brought within the reach of everybody and not to be silent also about something praiseworthy in the work of the two Pundits the alphabetical list of proper names subjoined offers a precious help to who ever desires to compare with each other the different Sanskrit representative of a given story told in the original Prākṛit Brhatkathā Now also every one may easily control the exactness of the judgment of Buhler and Levi on the nature and the poetical worth of the abstract of that poem composed by Ksemendra Its length is a little greater than was to be expected from the statement of Buhler *Ind. Int.* I 1 p 301 about the colophon of the MS required by him the whole work is contained there at 7080 lines yet the printed text of the Brhatkathāmañjarī amount to a little more than 7561 śloka 3)

Since the Kathāsaritsāgara, if I have exactly computed, consists of 21358, the size of Kṣemendia's abstract is a little greater than the third part of that composed by Somadeva

The following synopsis may show the concordance of the lambakas in both

<i>Bṛhathkathāmāñjarī</i>		<i>Kathāsaritsāgara</i>	
Kathā-pūtha	lambaka I in 3 gucehas of 72 + 223 + 97 = 392 cl.	lambaka I in 8 tarauḡas =	818 cl
Kathā-mukha	" II in 2 gucehas of 117 + 274 = 421 "	" II " 6 "	= 871 "
Lāvāṇaka	" III = 114 "	" III " 6 "	= 1198 "
Naravā-harajanma	" IV = 142 "	" IV " 3 "	= 501 "
Caturdā-rikā	" V = 263 "	" V " 3 "	= 818 "
Suayapra-bhā	" VI = 215 "	" VIII " 7 "	= 1544 "
Madana-mancukā	" VII = 612 "	" VI " 8 "	= 1421 "
Velā	" VIII = 75 "	" XI " 1 "	= 115 "
Çacāuka-vatī	" IX in 3 gucehas of 882 + 1435 + 118 = 2435 "	" XII " 36 "	= 1929 "
Viśamaçila	" X = 288 <sup>1)</sup> "	" XVIII " 5 "	= 1120 "
Madhātavati	" XI = 83 "	" XIII " 1 "	= 220 "
Padmāvati	" XII = 115 "	" XVII " 6 "	= 993 "
Pañca	" XIII = 236 "	" XIV " 1 "	= 624 "
Ratna-prabhā	" XIV = 508 "	" VII " 9 "	= 1628 "
Alaukātavati	" XV = 375 "	" IX " 6 "	= 1739 "
Çaktiyoḡas	" XVI = 646 "	" X " 10 "	= 2128 "
Mahā-bhūçaka	" XVII = 55 "	" XV " 2 "	= 301 "
Suratī-maṇḡarī	" XVIII = 215 "	" XVI " 3 "	= 420 "

<sup>1)</sup> This number is a little too low, and the former as much too high, owing to the intermixture of part of the story of Keçita and Kamlarpa in the adventures of Mṛgākalatā, as is explained above

Two things in this juxtaposition strike the eyes the *different arrangement* after the fifth lambika, and the *inequality* in the treatment of the subject matters in both collections. Putting off the difference in the order of the lambikas and the question as to the original arrangement in the Pāṇini Bīṭkathī to the following chapter, the difference as regards the briefness or the detailed description in narrating the same tales is sometimes very considerable. In some lambikas Kāthāpāṭha, Kathānūbhā, Çaṣṭhikāṭhi, Sūritamujari Ksemendra makes up a little less than half the number of ślokaś of Somadeva, but in others he is much shorter. In Viśvanātha, Ratnapāṭhī, Citardhikā and Çaktiyātra the proportion is between  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{3}$ , in Alamkāṭhikā between  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{5}$ , Sūryapāṭhā has in the collection of Somadeva even more than six times the size it has in the Bīṭkathamujari, owing, methinks, to the dislike of Ksemendra to dwell on the particulars of that battle epic of the old stamp, which describes a victory of Asuras over Devas and which under the able hands of Somadeva has grown into a charming heroic poem adorned with the manifold art but not too much crowded with the luxuriant excrescences of his native āluṅkāra.

A close comparison of the several parallel narrations in both cannot but confirm that impression of inequality. It will soon appear that it is the fault of Ksemendra not of Somadeva who, in striking contrast with his rival, has succeeded in keeping throughout the whole length of his composition the same style and the same proportions of his narrative. By this equality and harmony he surpasses Ksemendra in a very high degree. Likewise by his limpidity and his moderation in the employment of the various artifices, tricks and habits taught by Indian poetics and practised by Indian writers. He possesses qualities relatively seldom found with Sanskrit court poets and sought for in vain in the Bīṭkathamujari. We have quoted above (p. 11) the verdict pronounced in a few words by Bunnell about the *obscurity* and the *tedious waste of rhetoric embellishments* which spoil the pleasure while reading these the same stories that captivate the reader of the Kathāsarisaṅgraha. In fact, aiming at the glory of producing a compendious Bīṭkathī, Ksemendra does too often cue little about the clearness and perspicuity of style which are indispensable requisites in a story teller, on the other hand his aspiration at the fame of a master in *carṇigadya* makes him rather propense to subordinate the contents of the tales to the opportunity of rhetorical show. For skilled as he was in handling the manifold tools of *alaṅkāra* and being eager for displaying that skill, he too often delights in such descriptions

as he thought suitable for displaying his mastership in poetics  
*Purpureus, late qui splendet, nunc et alter aversatur pannus*

Since it does not lie within the scope of this disquisition to enter into an estimation of the poet Ksemendra, I refer the reader to the brilliant essay on this subject of SARVAT LAL in the *Journ As* of 1885. Yet it may be suitable to urge some prominent characteristics which appear in the *Bhāṭṭathamānu*. Ksemendra has a relish for exsultating in describing erotic matters. So at the outset of *libro IX* corresponding to *Naravāṇa* 1 foll., he interweaves in the visit of Lalitāloka to Naravāṇa a description of her beauty, not found in the *Kāthā*. In the first *vetala* tale he complacently enlarges the account of the voluptuous *prajñā* of Padmavati and her prince, the *vetala* *Bhik* p 297 120—126 correspond to the one *ekloka* *Kāthā* 75 131. In the 7<sup>th</sup> *vetala* *ks* (= 6<sup>th</sup> *Som*) three additional *ślokas* (p 319 397—399) are bestowed on the beauty of the bathing hindress. The story of *Jimutavāṇana* as narrated in the 16<sup>th</sup> *vetala* offers him the opportunity of drawing a detailed picture of the extraordinary grace and beauty of *Malayavati* which he executes in due order beginning with a praise of her feet and concluding with the top of her head, no less than twelve *ślokas* are required for it whereas the *Kathasarisagara* can suffice with five (*Bhik* p 801 792—803 *ep* to *Kāthā* 90 11—15) — Among the digressions of a different nature I mention *Bhik* p 389 1275—1283 praise of *Sundarasena* his beauty and prowess (*ep* *Kāthā* 101 46) p 461 138—145 praise of lake *Pampa* (*ep* *Kāthā* 107 9) p 289 290—305 dance of *Hamsavati* (*ep* *Kāthā* 71 76 77) p 300 *śl* 783—789 description of the pear-tree grove of *Jimutavāṇana* of the sea and of the tempest, that broke the ship of *Samudradatta* (p 121 *śl* 78 foll.) of heavenly and atmospheric phenomena (p 57 *cl* 112 foll.) Likewise p 292 62 foll the *śūṅgapitree* with the dead body hanging on it not to speak of that famous bombastic patch descriptive of the awful cemetery in the first *vetala* treated by *Lal* *Journ As* 1886 I p 191

The fault of too great conciseness and of obscurity in telling the tales is exhibited very differently. Some portions of the *Bhik* man *prajñā* suffer more from it than others. *Manikowski* who edited the *Pancatantra* section happened to fall into a part of the poem, where its author seems to have striven at the utmost brevity perhaps owing to his averseness from apologies or to some other reason he hurried over that track of the Great Tale. Nor did he feel much liking for the *markhakathas* which, in *Somadeva's* poem are inter

scattered between the different parts of Pāncatantra. Most of them he put aside entirely, the few to which he gave a place — twelve upon the whole (one of them not found in Kathās) against 47 in Kathās — are so condensed that they can hardly be understood and have lost all their flavour. So e.g. this śloka

*abudho bhāndadaridryad elasmin nidadhe ghate*

*īkṣmīṣaṁ jalam ca karyartham jenasau kusyatam yayan ||*

(p. 388, cl. 572)

is the parallel of Kathās 61, 10—13

*mandabuddhir abhūt kaccit, puman nṛṣi sa caikada*

*prabhute devatapujam karisyann ity acintayat ||*

*upayuktan mama snunadhupidyartham jalānalan,*

*sthapayami tad elasthan, tan cighram prapnuṣyami yathu ||*

*ity alocyambukumbhantah kṣiptvāgnim samīreṣa sah*

*prutaṣ ca īkṣate yatat gato 'gnir nastam ambu ca ||*

*anuramatve toyē dṛṣṭe lasyabhāvan mukham*

*ludrg ca, sahasasya lokasyasit p īkṣ smitam ||*

The following one

*lāṣṭī vyadhuc ca juyaya labdhīlalanakharanā bahu*

*rasanum abudhah kanthe haram ca jaghanasthale ||*

(p. 556, cl. 575)

is the simple remnant of the story related by Somadeva (61, 24—27) in this manner

*grumyah lāṣṭī kṣanau bhṛmum prapalanakharanam malat ||*

*ratraṁ rajakulo caturair nṛiṣa tatra mūṣṭitam*

*yad gṛhīta sa tatrawa bharyam tena vyabhīṣayat ||*

*babandha mekhalam mūrdhni haram ca jaghanasthale*

*nipatan karayos lasyah larnayor api kankṣan ||*

*hasadbhiḥ kṣyiptam lokair buddhīḥ rajo jalora tat*

*tasmat vabhananam, tan tu paśuprayam mūroca sah ||*

Such cases, however of extreme aridity are comparatively rare. On the other hand, now and then the mind of the reader is gladdened when he falls in with some piece written in an easy and pleasing style and without misuse of rhetoric implements, and which though inferior to the greater genius of Somadeva may stand to some extent the comparison with their parallels in the Kathāsarit-saṁgraha. The narrative, in a few cases, may be even broader. The episode of Kāṇvaśaraṇa carried through the air by the son of Somaprabhā her friend, firstly to old Cāṇvīṭ (= Prīṇvīṭ in Kathās) afterwards to young Udayana is told in eighteen ślokas (p. 186 339—346) whereas twelve suffice in the correspondent

place of Kathis (31 '0—1) The fable of the mouse, the cat, the owl and the ichneumon is, if not fuller, yet more detailed in the *Bṛhī māṅgali* (p. 196, 177—196) than it is in Kathi 33 106—129. This confirms once more what I have said about the *inequality* of the work of Ksemendra, who at other times took such care to epitomize stories told at great extent in his original, that he e.g. reduced the chief incidents of the story of Aśokadittī to a few lines (cp *Bṛhī māṅgali* p. 126 with Kathi 2, 162 foll.) and summarized the whole tale of *Muktaphaladhari*, which fill up two trimeters of 116 śloka, together in Kathis, in *five* ślokas (*Bṛhī māṅgali* p. 148, 101—115) 1)

To notice also another feature which struck me while perusing the poem of Ksemendra, he *clings more to things religious* than Somadeva. I do not say that his religious feeling is deeper. In common natures profoundness of that sentiment is ordinarily not found and I am inclined to give more credit in that point to the fine and delicate mind of the knower of men to whom we owe the Katha than to the polygraphist made of coarser stuff always ready to write a poem on a given subject. Ksemendra was well versed in mythological and theological matters. One of his spiritual teachers was a fervent Brahmin; another his upādhyaya in rhetoric, the famous Gujar philosopher Abhinava Gupta and he must have grown up in an atmosphere of devout practice. We learn from the preface at the end of his Bilikamangala as well as from the appended to other poems of his that his father was a very pious man and wealthy too who placed him of old in the temple of Sivarambhu and bestowed a quarter of a *kāṣṭhā* worth on pious works. Among his other writings two bear an exclusively religious character, one of them the Digvijayanta praises the ten avatars of Viṣṇu in the other the Avadamakalpita his last composition he extols with a magnificent apparel the lofty deeds of self-sacrifice of the Bodhisattva. He was thoroughly acquainted it seems with both religions \*) and would willingly preach in his verses on topics of morals and religion. That is why even

) There are even a few instances of tales summarized in o e çloka as I w Canla mah na got his wife the daughter of the Duta Ag raka (p 189) and the story of Cakra (p 3314) who bore the first wheelinent nti sal loc rrt v statement about the absence of that stor fro the Bṛh kṇa jārī article on Tl Man with the Wheel (*Bṛj J saktat It t sor Zal lant e loke kñe sa Nel Id e* 1906 p 19). The name Cakra does not occur in the Index of the ed tel text.

) It is familiar to with Buddhists and Fulltille says are if we compare parallel places of him and Somadeva in those cases where Buddhists matters play a

such a worldly poem, as this abstract of the Bṛhatkathā really is, contains comparatively large portions devoted to such matters. Devatāstūtis are not wanting in the Kathās neither, both Somadeva and Kṣemendra must have found them in the Pūṣpācī original, but on such occasions the latter in length and exuberance of them outdoes the former. In the story of the Kāṣmī king Bhūmānda or Bhūmandana — cp Bilik p 266 foll with Kathās 73, 79 foll — who took his way to Pātālā through a Kāṣmī entrance to the subterranean world, the local legend about this *aditus ad inferos* is incidentally related, how Pradyumna, watching for his son Anuruddha led away to Pātālā by his sweetheart Uṣī, obtained from Gaurī the favour that she would keep guard on the mountain commanding that entrance. In Kathās 73, 110 it is simply said that „he won over Cīrikā with hundreds of prizes”, Kṣemendra makes him utter a stotra in full ten ślokas (612—651). The concluding lambaka (XVIII) of the latter relates among other things the death of the old king Udayana. On hearing the news of it, Nṛpaśāradatta, his son, bursts out in lamentations. To Somadeva a few lines suffice to describe this complaint, his affliction and mourning and the words of consolation of his attendance (cp the parallel passage t 111, 86 foll), Kṣemendra would not allow himself to lose this opportunity of dwelling upon common-place sentences about the vanity and vanity of all human things and the necessity of death, he spends on that sermon no less than thirty ślokas. In another case he combines his claim of piramont poetical skill with his devotion, when he describes the glory and great feats of Viṣṇu in artful prose embellished by long compounds and the like, which passage by a singular whim he put into his metrical composition, no other prose occurring in it. It is found p 526 of the printed text and corresponds with the stuti Kathās t 51, 29—38. On another occasion, in vetīla nr 12, we meet with three uṣā stanzas to expound the power of karīṇa and its fruit, corresponding with one similar stanza of Somadeva (Bṛhām 335, 597—599 cp with Kath 86, 15). Sometimes his predilection for moral sentences and the like makes him do wrong to the *anvaya* he had to observe in the representation of the hero of his tale. In the 16<sup>th</sup> vetīla, a subject matter quite of his liking — for it

---

part in the narration. So P 158, śl 9 Sukhavatī, the Elysium of Mal is mentioned, but the word puzzles the editors who put a sign of interruption after it, likewise p 52, śl 61b where the corrupt form from one ms *karāṇa* has been put into the text, the other has *karāṇa* — P 114 in the sermon on *viṣṇu* the name of king Arka occurs, but it lies hidden under the corrections *Arka* and *Kāṣ*





et même, cette hypothèse admise, qu'il se fût, avec un acquit de quelque tiente ou cinquante ans, aussi mal tue de la besogne" This argument, a „on-presque de sentiment", as it is styled by Lévi himself, has not so great stress as the other derived from the introductory verses of the Kathasaritsāgara, t 1, 11 and 12

*aucityanayarakṣa ca yathurakti vidhiyate  
katharasūighatena kāvyamcaśya ca yojana ||  
vaidagdhyaḥkhyatīlobhaya mama nāṇayam udyamah  
kim tu nanakathajālasmitisaukrtyasiddhaye ||*

These ślokas, according to him, are an implicit disapproval of the work of his predecessor, which as a matter of fact is imbued with the selfsame defects as are disclaimed by Somadeva in order to justify his own composition. In this point I fully agree with Lévi. Śloka 12 so unmistakably hints at some rival poet or some rivalizing literary work, that long before I knew anything about the Brhatkathīmāyām, I understood Somadeva's declaration as having a polemic character. And forsooth, he who knows both Sanskritizations of the Brhatkathā cannot but acknowledge in Somadeva's protestation against the *vaidagdhyaḥkhyatīlobha* his making front against the rhetorical style of Ksemendra and that showy self-ostentation as perspicuous among others in his *prāśasti* at the end of his poem, where he boasts of himself. Ksemendranuma *tanuṇaśaśya vidhatsu vicitrah | prayatah | vaigosthinaḥ sumagrahauyogyatam* (p. 620, śl. 36) „Il semble donc naturel de croire qu'en écrivant ces vers Somadeva pensait à son précurseur."

My interpretation of cl. 11 is different from that of Lévi. This is partly in consequence of a various reading partly because he misunderstood the meaning of the words *aucitya* and *anaya*. As to the difference of reading, *vidhiyate* (Dingirp's ed.) seems preferable to *abhidhiyate* (Brockhaus), but in 1886 the ed. of Dingirp had not yet appeared<sup>1)</sup>. *Aucitya* does not mean 'les convenances littéraires', it is the technical term to signify 'appropriateness

<sup>1)</sup> I am inclined to think that the fault in Brockhaus' ed. does not originate in his text but in some mistake either in copying or rather of the typographer (cl. 10 l. 2 l. 4 ed. has *vidhate* instead of *abhidhate* but cl. 11, l. 1 l. 6 *vidhiyate* for *abhidhiyate*). There can be no question about the correctness of the readings of Dingirp's edition. The false ones have led a travesty every scholar who before tried to explain these lines. As long as the interpretation rested on a corrupt text they were reputed to be „difficult" the genuine text is plain.

<sup>2)</sup> „J'ai respecté autant que j'ai pu les convenances littéraires et l'ordre naturel; j'ai établi chacune des sections du poème de manière à ne pas interrompre les scènes

taken in the widest sense of the word and bearing as well on the different objects, character individualities to be represented in a poetical composition as on the adorning implements and the choice of words expressions and images 1) *Aucityamaya* then is the same as *aucityamalaham* literally, the being provided with appropriateness. LEVI also misunderstood *kavyamasya yojana* Mankow 11 rightly objects that the sing *kavyamasya* cannot at any rate mean chacune des sections du poeme (so the passage quoted p. 22 note 2), but his own interpretation, that *kavyam* should be referred to some special part of the poem is right neither. To catch the meaning of *kavyam* it must be compared with *daśa*, *anantaratna* and the like. Somadeva declares that he does not claim the pretension of making a *kavya* out of the *Bhakti*. He has only admixed a small portion of *kavya* qualities to the simple collection of popular tales. In other terms *ananta* has here a signification not unlike *gandhi* at the end of compounds taught by Panini V 4 136 a tinge of a little of. My translation of 11 is accordingly. I have taken care to preserve the appropriateness (of description diction etc. of the original work) and I have added to it some qualities proper to a *kavya* without however spoiling by this the flavour of the tales. I have added elegance of style and many a poetical ornament yet so that I have not deprived the tales of their power to express the *rasas* or sentiments aimed at.

This prefatory declaration of Somadeva is as true as it is modest. He displays in a high degree *l'art de faire un livre*. His narrative captivates both by its simple and clear though very elegant style and diction and by his skill in drawing with a few striking pictures of types and characters taken from the real every day life. Hence it is that even in the miraculous and fantastic facts and events that make up the bulk of the main story and of a great deal of the incidental tales the interest of the reader is uninterruptedly kept. His lively and pleasant art of story telling — though now and then encumbered with inflatedness or vitiated by far fetched fil

et les passions (rasas) (11 p. 219) This translation is not given as will be shown in the following chapter as far as regards the meaning of a

) I can do nothing better than quote the sense and definition of the term as given in the *śloka* 7 (el *kavyam* 111)

śloka 7 (el *kavyam* 111)  
śloka 7 (el *kavyam* 111)  
śloka 7 (el *kavyam* 111)

In the following *śloka* 8—10 I enumerate the *ananta* particular things to which *aucitya* is applicable

wit<sup>1</sup>), that drawback of so many Sanskrit literary high style productions — is enhanced also by his native humour and the elegant and pointed sentences strewn about here and there with a good taste. One instance may exemplify the distance which separates in this respect the two abbreviators of the Brhatkathā. Vararuci relates to Cakṛatā, how he got befriended with the Rākṣas. With Ksemendraras well as Somadevaras this account takes up three ślokas. In the following columns Kṣ is placed on the left, Som on the right

Brhkm p 22, 186—188

dandadhīpatyam āsadya  
rājyāḥam śrayam arthitah |  
rakṣasa kalarāpena  
tenarā nīci saṁgatah ||

sa mam vāca cakitam  
vācānnyogragrahah |  
rupenabhyadhīta nari  
ka, satyanti kathyatam iti ||,

ya yasyābhīśatī lole  
sa tasyadhīkarapim |  
sa niṣamyeti madhukyam  
samtuṣṭo mitratam agat ||

Kathīs 5, 50—52

tac chrutā Yoganando mam  
'alāṣaṇa nagaradhīpam |  
'bhramante cuparyam atṛuham  
bhramantam rakṣasam nīci ||

sa ca mam aradad bruhī  
vidyate nagare 'tra ka |  
surupā stritī tac chrutā  
vīkasyakam tam abravām ||

ya yasyābhīmatā mūrkhā  
suripā tasya sa bhavet |  
tac chrutāna tiyagīṇa  
ṇito 'smity aradat sa mūrī ||

## APPENDIX

List of necessary corrections from Lévi and Mankowski to be made in the Bombay ed. of *Bihatkathāmañjarī*.

- p 2, cl. 13 Lévi *sudhāsindhuqarbha*<sup>o</sup>, — 3, cl 24 L *pyāśahasite*, — 4, cl. 42 L *\*akubhā cīram*, — 8, cl 22 L (MS A) *idyā Varāḍ dvīpād vo 'stu pāpyeti*, — 10, cl 39 L *hemalabhah sadā yasya*, — 11, cl 49 *dhātām adhiko vege*, — 41 52 L *ptatah, satatam kākānapīradah*, — cl 60 b L *ardhuṣṭānti vedhakuntīpīdām*, — p 13, cl 79 and where farther on the word occurs *dantapāśikāh*<sup>1)</sup> for *dantapāśīlah*, — 14, cl 80 L (MS A) *prastutipahnavah pāpo*, — 16, cl 112 L *hemalotim aham svayam*, cp 113 d; — 19 cl 145 L *yo 'yam cītharīsamkāśah cāl hācalayāsamkulah*, — 20, cl 157 L *pratimāpātam adbhutam*, cp Kathās 5, 20, — cl 161 L *antihpīndīyān*, — cl. 169 L (MS A) *śuśucur dūlīhasamīptah*, — 21, cl 170 L *śatātālam sakhe . . . ratulo bhavan*, — cl 172 L *tam oīdarayam* — cl 177 *śarīrmaṇy aśankītah*, cp Kathās 5, 69 foll., — 23, cl 207 *vadhvā* instead of *baddhā*, — 24, cl 214 *matīa* for *mātya* — p 26, cl 9 L has this necessary line added from MS A between 9a and 9b *yah cāpamāsam ymāyos darśanīna indhāsyah* — cl 11 *aīqīstīmāyo īarīsyah* — 31, cl 70 *mujlhamanasam* — 32, cl 88 *kudhās ījyanty anī adī*
- p 290, cl 39 Lévi *kmapāh* instead of *lāspāh* — p 291 cl 50 *bhīantālanapana*<sup>o</sup>, — p 293, cl 67 *matalah*, — cl 72 *sphatkeanon tu arīh* — p 294, cl 78 *īdhakāpīhullānīlī anamī sanīn*, — p 295, cl 90 *tīnā ītmopasūcatam* — p 299, cl 149 *sapālīpāh pratīpanghah kūrīn mīkīan hī dīyah īśādyā īājanītrās tām*, — p. 301, cl 166 *te yotajīvīn* <sup>o</sup> *akornh īncucur dīyāh* — cl 177 *śadanopīatīnācandīam* — p 302, cl 182 *pūtrālayam*
- p 561, cl 256 Mankowski *śmāpī opānamī* Theed has *īstīhītrōyā*<sup>o</sup> likewise p 572, cl 392 *śī*<sup>o</sup>, — cl 263 *īma īśasthagītakīamah* — p 562, cl 269 *pīramī yāyāh* — cl 271 *sphīrtīstāmāśhamāstātīkānam* — p 565, cl. 280 *īyena* (by conjecture) for *māhīna*, — cl 281 *dūhīte* (by conj.) for *dūhīkārīh*, — cl 283 *yād bīlasādhīyam*, — p 561, cl 291 *īyītam* for *īyīyam*, — cl 293 *īmīhās tām īyā*, — cl 296 *īātātānītrāpīte* — p 567, cl 303 *śālotīśī īśā mīnah* — p 566, cl 313 *darpāt so 'nyān īmābhīyēya* — p 563, cl 336 *īpatpīoptan*, — p 569, cl 356 *īlīsas*, — cl 359 *īāśān* <sup>o</sup> *īārīlāīyāh* (a good conjecture), — p 570, cl 363 *īātāh*, — p 571, cl 373 *tād īlīśāsya* <sup>o</sup> *īndīkīārī īyāyāt pām*, — cl 374 *nīstīnītrī abhāsātā*, — cl 378 *kīlīakūt*, — cl. 379 *sarpām* <sup>o</sup> *nāīgām*, — <sup>1)</sup> p 573, cl 401 *yātē kālē*, — p 574, cl 413 *yāntrārātham*, — p 575, cl 420 *yendāmī abhā īam dīhīstās tāt* (a good conj.), — cl 425 *īubdhakātīnīstō āyāyān . . . sarāngāh*, — cl 428 *dīīkīdīyājātā īīa tē*, — p 576, cl 431 *mīnthārō 'm*, — cl 434 *cāmīlāyān kīnamī*, — cl 437 *Meghāīāī nākhīyāh*, — cl 439 *śā*

<sup>1)</sup> Or *dantapāśīlah*. Both forms occur *quid* Lévi

<sup>2)</sup> P 573, cl 395 I read *acodayat* for *anodīyāt* of both editions

*saṃyaktva yaçola tathā* — *nyuktān yuktikoridāu*, — çl 110 *tva nam anyah*  
*parakramam* — p 577, çl 411 *tyaktvā sudurlabhaḥ*, — çl 447 *glattayan*, —  
 çl 451 *prasiddhya çaçino nāma* (a good conject, cp Pañc III, 82, ed Bühler  
 Kielhorn), — p 578, çl 454 *simlīsto 'atatarāçu*, — çl 455 *Vyaṃam* for  
*Vilāṃam*, cp. Kathas 62, 32, — çl 461 *reçmadanaṃ dīdinaṃ* (a good conject<sup>1)</sup>),  
 — p 579, çl 466 *'aiçvarya*, — çl 468 *skanthe tmodlāḥ*, — p 580, çl 486  
*tulyakālaya*, — p 581, çl 489 *Arumaid* .. *kalimulroççālini* (a good  
 conject), — çl 490 *ditā/takamih*, cp çl 367, — çl 491 *amicyant*, — çl  
 500 *tyatto liāhā* [or perhaps better *tyaktvā dīḥam*], the ed Bomb has here mere  
 nonsense, — p 582, çl 506 *abhyrdhīkam*, — çl 510 *smiāçī asya çliāri*  
*duṛye*, — p 583, çl 519 *sadbhīrjo vṛddhasarasah*<sup>2)</sup>, — çl 521 *bañlīçu* instead  
 of *iṣḍlīçu* and *titheta* for *tithimta*, — p 584, çl 529 *pañamamāsaṃ* (a good  
 conject), — p 586, çl 552 *uṣaṃ iṣṭaya bhate u yo lu bhāṃçu iṣṭi/sa*  
*lajjitasaktiçāṭam bhāṅkīçā saṃyamaçrojaḥ* — çl 584 *krītu* for *kītu* —  
 p 587, çl 587 *kurīṣṭa*, — çl 588 *grhapovītam*, — çl 582 *djāçu* for *djāçim*

This list is of course limited to those cases, where evident  
 corrections or the better readings from MSS have been overlooked  
 by neglect of previous publications which no editor of the Brhat-  
 kathāmañjarī ought to ignore. What inference is to be drawn from  
 this as to the authority of the Bombay edition in the by far much  
 greater part of the poem, where it is in fact the *editio princeps*  
 in its fullest sense?

Inversely there are found sometimes a few better readings in  
 the Bombay edition, adopted from the two mss on which that  
 edition is based. Lévi and Mañikowski did not find them in the  
 mss at their disposal. But the number of this kind of various  
 readings is rather small and it is now no longer of utility to enu-  
 merate them. I only mention one instance. P 51, çl 3 *ghūḥkuḥ*  
 is of course the right reading, not *dhūḥkūḥ*, as was edited by Lévi,  
*ghūḥka* 'owl' is not rarely met with in the Brhatkathām, e.g. p 576,  
 çl 441 and p 581, çl 499.

<sup>1)</sup> Pañc III is to be correct *dīdinaṃ*, so that the whole becomes *pañamamāsaṃ dīdinaṃ*.

<sup>2)</sup> Çl. 518 I correct thus *uṣṭiçyāçāṭam bhāṅkīçā saṃyamaçrojaḥ* for *uṣṭiçyāçāṭam*.

## CHAPTER II.

THE BRITANNIA ITS CONTENTS

In the first chapter it has been shown that the conclusions drawn from a partial comparison in 1871, by Bühler as to the mutual relation of the poems of Ksemendra and Somadeva as epitomes of the *Bṛhatkathā* are fully confirmed by a cross examination of the two complete works. There can be not the least doubt about the existence in Kashmir in the eleventh century of that vast encyclopædia of tales in the Pañcāli dialect which is acknowledged as the common source of both *Bṛhatkathāmāñjarī* and *Kathā-vatsīgārā*. Now the question arises, whether it is possible to resurrect that old Pañcāli *Bṛhatkathā* with the help of its Sanskrit redactions.

Of course, only materially. Considering that Śaundarāya admittedly abridged his original and Ksemendia tacitly for he is silent about it abridged it likewise and even much more, since his abridgement is three times shorter than the Kathas, the impossibility of bringing back even for a small part its verbal form need no further demonstration. I have met with five lines common to both Brhm p 173, 188 = Kath t 28, 182 the second part of Brhm 131, 9 and Kath 101, 17, the śloka Brhm 496, 342 = Kath 10 216 22a. Here the presumption of their being taken from the Pañcāli original with no other alterations than those required by the change of dialect is very great, if we take into consideration that as a rule the concord of both collections of tales as to the contents, even in particulars, is as great as their discrepancy in wording and expression. The cases of their using the same special term or the same turn of phrase are comparatively rare, even when employing the same simile. In such cases, then, there is some probability that such a term and such a phrase are the Sanskrit equivalents of

such a term and such a price.



Yet upon the whole these coincidences are not frequent, and even if they were more numerous than they are, the profit to be obtained from a systematic and exhaustive exploration of them would be small. It is not difficult to put a Pañcīa garb on those words and turns of phrase which it would be made probable that are borrowed by the Sanskrit redactors from the original Pañcīa poem. By applying the scrupulous rules laid down by the grammarians how to make Pañcīa from Śauraseni or from Sanskrit (see PISCURI *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen* p. 27—29 p. 135) it may be taken for granted that in the Pañcīa Bṛhatkathā the words *śuddhātta* *hāṣṭri*, *anteurapati* *parayo* *tipalā* *komaplandam* *muttattal* *so* *latanelacano* *sattkaveso* etc. occurred, but this result is meretricious, as early as 1874, in his dissertation *magnum de grammaticis Pañcīis* putting together the Pañcīa quotations by Hemacandra in the 1st chapter of the 8<sup>th</sup> book of his grammar expressed as his opinion that they are borrowed from the Pañcīa Bṛhatkathā (see p. 33 of that dissertation). This is very probable indeed yet the smallness of the few fragments and the circumstance that they consist of some general phrases not applicable to a certain fact or story related in the Bṛhatkathā forbids to identify them with corresponding passages in the Sanskrit redactions.

A trace of the origin of the work is found in a few proper names. Kṣemendra and Somadeva though as a rule of course there is conformity in this respect, are not rarely at variance: the one calls somebody e.g. Śaundarādhara who is called Śaundarimatsya by the other. In this way there are a many slight discrepancies as Yaśodhara (K<sup>s</sup>) Yaśodhara (S) Dharmadatta (K<sup>s</sup>) Dharmapala (S), Madanmanjari (K<sup>s</sup>) Yaśodhara (S) etc. etc. Sometimes Kṣemendra prefers a shorter form of the name: the hero of the main story is called throughout Narayana<sup>1)</sup> not Narayanaidatta as he is invariably named by Somadeva and Mukta (or Mukti) ketu and Multadhara (K<sup>s</sup> p. 113 and 419) correspond to the Multaphalaketu and Muktaprakadhara of the seventeenth lambraka of Somadeva. Now, in a few instances it is plain that Kṣemendra's names have retained their Pañcīa shape whereas Somadeva's Sanskritized them. Of the kind are Kāmpila (Kathas. 25. 23) and Kāmpilla (Bṛh. 120, cl. 73) Potika (K. 67, 6) and Poti (B. 209 cl. 6) Iśvarī a name occurring thrice in the Kathas for three different ladies (B. 77. 30. 72. 15, 177) is Iśvarī in Bṛhatkathā

<sup>1)</sup> I ven Narayana (p. 14 cl. 68 p. 502 cl. 41) and 415) p. 51. 70 Narayana as is edited, is to be corrected into Narayana for a metrical reason.



corresponding Pāṇinī expressions in the original. Of the kind are the epithet *vaidīśvadaśesari* of the great dialectician, the Buddhist monk Ratnacandimati in Bṛhkm 253, 470 and Kath 72, 93, the designation of the superintendent of the zenana, who is falsely named to the king as the lover of Guṇavarā, by *antakpuriapati* both in Bṛhkm 491, 280 and in its parallel Kath 39, 27, the old king of Cāṇva-ti is styled *prajāyuk* both in Bṛhkm 182, 291 and its parallel Kath 30, 30 Likewise *triphalu* (Bṛhkm 232, 204 cp Kath 70, 13), *homabhānda* (Bṛhkm 233, 221 cp Kath 70, 70), *muktātthakāśa* (Bṛhkm 305, 260 cp Kath 78, 2), *śaśthāṇḍa* (Bṛhkm 232, 209 cp Kath 70, 56), *kalaneḥajana* (Bṛhkm 133, 223 cp Kath 26, 173), *rupadrayanahāṇḥṣayā* Bṛhkm 497, 345 cp Kath 40, 27), *acrukana* (Bṛhkm 223, 93 *tatra netrāt Tinctiāyā patito 'śrukana h lātau* <sup>1</sup>) cp Kath 69, 38 so [viz. Çivā] 'smusu prāteru al'no dakunūd acrukana h lātau/ bhūmā apulayat) The uniformity of utterance is hardly fortuitous here. In some other instances the common turn of phrase may point to the common source, the Pūracī work, as is shown by the following juxtaposition

Bṛhkm	Kathās <sup>1</sup>
173, 191 <i>cruyate munusāh saḥk- yam bhajanti lila dātatah prthivyatḥ Prthoh pūrtam putiyā sakhyaṁ Arundhati   bheje</i>	28, 191b <i>dūyā yanti ca munusāh asamasnehātḥituk saṁgatim   bheje kim nīpateh Prthos tann- yayā saḥkhyam na s trundkati?</i>
375, 1134 <i>ayam labdho 'si su bhaga līa gamiṣyasi me purāh</i>	95, 74 <i>līa yasi labdho 'si ma yety ālapanti etc</i>
386, 1239 <i>iāg utacāṣarvini</i>	100, 36 <i>tāud iug atīa gaganūd uccacūṣaravini</i>
393, 1320 <i>nabhasata   abhājyata prārahanam</i>	101, 141 <i>balīyasā/vutena tasya rahanam hanyamānum abhājyata</i>
498, 361 <i>sa lādūcū nījam dīstū jarūdharatām ānanam satūṣaram nūmbhojām abhuc cin tagnitapīlak</i>	10, 15 <i>hūmāhatam nūmbhojām patitāmānam ānanam darayanti latham dīyati? hu dhū me maranam iaram</i>
511, 11 <i>dhanyukam ite iadīnyu</i>	57, 77 <i>dhanyūsmite iadanti ca</i>
553, 155 <i>chittisaḥ kairanarīkām/ lacchastrenana sahasa praya yuu tasya etc</i>	58, 99 <i>lacchastrenana buddhasya lānanūsām cakurā sū</i>

<sup>1</sup> I quote according to the reading of MS २१, registered in the foot note, the reading adopted by the editors is obviously a false one

Yet, upon the whole, these coincidences are not frequent, and even if they were more numerous than they are, the profit to be obtained from a systematic and exhaustive exploration of them would be small. It is not difficult to put a Pañcālī grub on those words and turns of phrase which it would be made probable that are borrowed by the Sanskrit redactors from the original Pañcālī poem. By applying the scanty rules laid down by the grammarians how to make Pañcālī from Āmagaseni or from Sanskrit (see Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen* p 27—29, p 135) it may be taken for granted that in the Pañcālī Bihatkathā the words *ātiddirathakesari*, *anteurapati*, *pavayo*, *typhalā*, *homaphāndam*, *muttāṣṭakāso*, *katānekaśano*, *sattkāreso* etc. occurred, but this result is meagre. Pischel, as early as 1874, in his „dissertation inauguralis” *de grammaticis Prākriticis*, putting together the Pañcālī quotations by Hemacandra in the last chapter of the 8<sup>th</sup> book of his grammar, expressed as his opinion that they are borrowed from the Pañcālī Bihatkathā (see p 33 of that dissertation). This is very probable, indeed; yet, the smallness of the few fragments and the circumstance that they consist of some general phrases not applicable to a certain fact or story related in the Bihatkathā forbids to identify them with corresponding passages in the Sanskrit redactions.

A trace of the origin of the work is found in a few proper names. Kṣemendra and Somadeva, though as a rule of course, there is conformity in this respect, are not rarely at variance: the one calls somebody e.g. *Samindrādatta*, who is called *Samundramatsya* by the other, in this way there are a many slight discrepancies, as *Yajñaketu* (Kṣ) *Yaçāhketu* (S), *Dhanadatta* (Kṣ) *Dhyanapāla* (S), *Mudranamudari* (Kṣ), *Madanasmudari* (S), etc. etc. Sometimes Kṣemendra prefers a shorter form of the name, the hero of the main story is called throughout *Naravāhana*<sup>1)</sup>, not *Naravāhanadatta*, as he is invariably named by Somadeva, and *Muktī* (or *Mukta*)-*ketu* and *Muktādhvaja* (Kṣ p 413 and 419) correspond to the *Muktīphalaketu* and *Muktāphaladhvaja* of the seventeenth laubhaka of Somadeva. Now, in a few instances it is plain that Kṣemendra's names have retained their Pañcālī shape, whereas Somadeva Sanskritized them. Of the kind are *Kāmpilya* (Kathās 25, 23) and *Kāmpilla* (Bṛh 120, śl 73), *Potraka* (K 67, 6) and *Potr* (B 209, śl 6), *Tejovatī*, a name occurring thrice in the Kathās for three different ladies (18, 77 30, 72 43, 177) is *Tejovatī* in *Bṛhatham*

<sup>1)</sup> Even *Naravāha* (p 474, śl 68, p 502 śl 415 and 418) p 221, 70 *Naravāhana*, as is edited, is to be corrected into *Naravāha* for a metrical reason.

(p 84, čl 187 p 183, 302) <sup>1)</sup>, Rādhā (K 71, 2<sup>o</sup>) and Rāthā (B 279, čl 783), Vakiolākṛ (K 93, 3) and Vmkolākṛ (B 369, čl 1011), Thinthīkarāla (K 122, 71) and Thienthīkarālī (B 122, 71) BÖHMER, in his article in the *Ind Ant* (I, p 309) noticed this point already, yet his statement is to be corrected in this, that both S and Kṣ agree in the name of Dīpākṛm; Durgaprasād's ed has this form, not Dīpāk, as is edited by Brockhaus. Another trace of the original language may be left in the false form of the name Pārvatīkṣa (the Nāga who dispersed Migānkadatta and his comrades) which is read Brhkm p 232, čl 210 *Nāgo Pārvatākḥyo 'sti bhavane hamsasucite*, since the right name appears čl 224, it is probable that Kṣemendra who worked in a hurry misunderstood the first time the meaning of Paṇṇ *pāvatākḥho*, but Sanskritized it better afterwards <sup>2)</sup>

It is of greater importance to examine how much a close comparison of the two Sanskrit redactions may afford in the way of reconstituting the scheme and the arrangement of the old Brhatkathā.

It has been shown in the First Chapter (*supra*, p 15 and 16) that the Kathāsaritsāgarā and the Brhatkathāmañjarī agree in the number and the titles of the different lambikas but, after lambikā V, disagree in the order of them, even to a considerable degree. Which of the two represents the original Brhatkathā? Or perhaps neither?

As far as I know, the question has not been examined before. Of the Sanskrit scholars who occupied themselves with the Kathāsaritsāgarā, Mrśnikowski alone, I believe, expressed an opinion on this point. P IX of the „Einleitung“ of his work on the Pañcāttra-Portions in Kath and Brhkm, mentioned above (p 12 n 2), he says: „Wie uns der Zusammenstellung bei Iśa zu sehen ist, ist die Reihenfolge der ersten fünf Bücher bei Somadeva genau dieselbe wie bei Kṣemendra, nur die übrigen dreizehn Bücher sind bei beiden anders geordnet. Ich glaube daher, dass Somadeva in V 11 [of his tr 1, vide *supra*, p 23] unzweideutig erklärt, dass er in diesem Theile seines Gedichts die Anordnung des Stoffes im

<sup>1)</sup> But Kathā 17, 31 Somadeva retained Tejvatī just as he found it in the Pañcāttra Brhatkathā, the corresponding verse apud Kṣemendra is p 79 čl 126.

<sup>2)</sup> The name Karmasena in the Kathā (I 69 and 112) of the father of (अणि) कवति, the sweetheart of Migānkadatta, is Kandarjāsena in the Prhkm (see p 222, čl 85 p 102, čl 8). The original had *cille* karmasena, which being written with anusvāra + m, may have induced Kṣemendra in his negligent way to accept it as karmasena, or it was Somadeva who misread the name karmasena, if the long *a* was denoted in his MS of Brhatkathā by a small curve above the *a*-sign, which he read as *r* before consonant.

Original geändert hat. Hatte er sich genau an seine Vorlage gehalten wie konnte er da von Rücksicht auf den Zusammenhang und von einem Ordnen reden? In meine Erklärung spricht auch der Umstand dass ein paar Geschichten sich bei Somadeva wiederholen. Ob diese Wiederholungen sich nicht auch bei Kshemendra finden, kann ich leider nicht ermitteln ich glaube jedoch, dass dieselben in Gunadhya's *Bhaktakṛthi* nicht vorhanden waren und Somadeva auszuschreiben sind dem eine solche Unachtsamkeit bei einer Umarbeitung seiner Vorlage nur zu leicht zustossen konnte. Dass die fünf Bücher des Paucatantra bei Kshemendra zusammenhängen, bei Somadeva dagegen durch andere Geschichten von einander getrennt sind werden wir später sehen. Auch hierin hat wie ich glaube Kshemendra das Ursprüngliche bewahrt.

I have transcribed in full his argument that I might the better refute it. I begin to observe that Minkowski judged upon insufficient documents. He knew Somadeva but was little informed of the contents of the *Bhaktakṛthi* which was in manuscript at the time he wrote. Further he discredits the carefulness of Somadeva without sufficient reason. The so called want of diligence appearing in the fact of his relating the same story repeatedly is a mere fancy and supposed he had somehow founded this charge by argument. It would fail to account for a so great number of repetitions of the same tales as really occur in the *Kāthās*. And in the *Bhikṣu* too though not so often for e. g. the story of *Amṛtavaraha* is twice told and at great length in *Kāthās* t. 22 and t. 90 likewise in the *Bhikṣu* p. 107 f. and 353 f., the first part of the narration of *Amṛtavaraha* in *Kāthās* t. 52 reappears with the same names in t. 83 but also in *Bhikṣu* p. 328 and p. 318 f.) Therefore from all that which is alleged by Minkowski there remains but one point of importance whether he is right stating that Somadeva himself intimates that he had arbitrarily mingled the materials he took from the *Bhaktakṛthi*. Here I think he has misunderstood his text.

The statement of Somadeva alluded to is found in the preamble of his book t. 1. 11 *aucityamayaśakṣī ca* etc. We have dealt with this śloka *supra* p. 22 and 23 where we translated *aucityamaya* by the being provided with appropriateness. Somadeva declares that he endeavoured to keep intact in his work the good quality of his original of depicting things and persons with appropriated words

1) 1. 18. čl. 10<sup>2</sup> *tas t a ga at sa*, as sed t d must be corrected into *tas*  
*īna jarat sa a* in čl. 111 the right form of the name has remained intact



a mere phrase which discloses nothing as the author only affirms that the great tale he is about to narrate is not of his own invention. It is found in the Puranas and the Vedas so he says! A strange statement and a deceptive one moreover which permits us also to suppose that he took no scruple to act with his poem rather freely and according to his fancy. The resume of the books VI—XVIII (p. 617—619) which is put into the mouth of Narayana himself and which has no counterpart in the Kathasaritsagara is doubtless of his own invention.

By reasoning a priori, therefore one would be rather inclined to distrust the truthfulness of the arrangement of the lambakas of the Brihatkathamangali. But why should we reason upon generalities while evidence of a better kind may be obtained by a close comparison of the two sets of books that make up one the redaction of Somadeva and the other that of Ksemendra? Which of them will prove to afford the better and the more congruous and consistent course of facts as far as they belong to the frame story will have the better claim to be acknowledged as representative of the original order.

The first five lambakas following each other in the same order in both poems we must begin with lamb VI. This lambaka and the next ones are thus far arranged differently that lamb VI of Somadeva is the VII<sup>th</sup> of Ksemendra whereas lamb VIII of S corresponds to VI of K. Lamb VIII S = VI K is wholly taken up with an episode the story of Suryaprabha. The only difference is this Ksemendra subjoins it to the similar story of Çaktivega which makes up lamb V. He represents both narrations as being told by two Vidyardharas at different times to Udayana when Narayana-datta was an infant. Somadeva makes Suryaprabha narrate the story of the old Çakravartin Suryaprabha at a much later time when Narayana-datta was already married and her apparent discrepancy is of no consequence at all and does not yield any presumption in favour of either author.

But the case is different with respect to the lambaka Ratna-prabha which bears the number VII in the Kathasaritsagara = XIV of the Brihatkathamangali. That lambaka encompasses a portion of the main story as far as it relates how Narayana-datta got his wives Ratnaprabha and Karpurika. Somadeva places the events in the earlier part of the hero's adventures. Ksemendra in a much later period, when he had gained already victories in the celestial regions had recovered his chief queen Madanamaucika and was very near to be crowned emperor of all the Vidyardharas. It is not

difficult to show that Kṣ's division is not consistent with the regular course of the facts. The *Īmbika Ratnaprabhā* presupposes the heir apparent living with his father at Kauṇṭhibī and his being dependent on him, he has not yet obtained the powers of the Vidyādhara, his falling in love with the Vidyādhari Ratnaprabhā affords the first opportunity to him to be raised into the higher spheres, his love with Karpūrikā concerns a human lady, and it is only by means of a mechanical implement wrought by a human magician that he passes through the air to her distant country and comes back with her home. These facts are properly put between Īmb „Madanamaricukā” (Somadeva's VI <sup>1</sup>), treating of how he got his first wife, and Īmb „Alankāravatī,” in which he gains his second Vidyādhari (Somadeva's IX) and becomes more and more familiarized with the spheres on high. But being inserted, as Kṣemendra does, after the Īmbika „Panca” (Somadeva's XIV = Kṣ's XIII) these facts are utterly discordant. Nor is this arrangement suitable with respect to the Īmbika next in Kṣemendra, which is *Alankāravatī*, it destroys the natural connexion and coherence of Īmb „Panca” and Īmb „Mahābhūṣaka” (Som's XIV and XV), the victory of the hero and his being anointed as the Cakravartin of the Vidyādhara.

Kṣ's Īmb VIII is „Velā,” which is Īmb XI of Somadeva. In this book, a very short one, Nara obtains as his wife Jyendrasenā (Kṣ) or Jayendrasenā (Som), the sister of the two brothers who chose him to pass the judgment of their contest. By fixing the time of that marriage next to his marriage with his first queen Madanamaricukā Kṣemendra raises the lady to a higher rank than is consistent with the intention of the author of the *Bhīṣatkathā*, who evidently considered Ratnaprabhā, and no other woman, as the second queen, the relation of the father to Vāsavadattī and Padmāvatī has its parallel in that of the son to Madanamaricukā and Ratnaprabhā. Here too, it is plain, Kṣemendra's arrangement of the order of events is rather anomalous.

The Īmb „Panca” is almost entirely concerned with the frame-story. In the *Kathasaritsāgarā*, of which it is the XIV<sup>th</sup> Īmb, it begins with the rape of Madanamaricukā and the desolation of her husband at her loss, the various adventures connected with his inquiries after her and the endeavours taken to release her from the hands of Vinasavega are narrated in this book. Kṣemendra's

<sup>1</sup> Som's Īmb VIII „Sargaprabhā” is a mere episode, and does not belong to the frame story, cp. *supra*, p. 7.

XIII<sup>th</sup> book. Panch has exactly the same contents with one exception the rape of Madanamaucukī is not told there nor could it be told at this point of the tale since this occurrence was related in an earlier portion of the tale at the conclusion of the lamb

'Vela'. In other words Ks makes Manasavegi kidnap the chief queen of Naravahanadatta soon after his marrying his second wife whereas Som postpones the capture to a much later period of his exploits. Both the rape and the *faits et gestes* performed by the future Emperor of the Vidyadhara to recover his beloved one are related without interruption in the Kathasaritsagara within the limits of one lambika. In the Bṛhatkathamanjari Madanamaucukī is stolen away in lamb VIII and not regained before the poem has almost completed lamb XIII. The importance of this discrepancy becomes striking if we consider that the intermediate lambikas one of which Çiṅkavati (Ks s nr IX) numbers 2435 ślokas are crammed with a great mass of stories of the most various kind which intercept the main story. It is obvious even to a superficial observer that the arrangement of Somadeva is more suitable for a proper exposition of this part of the tale.

Moreover Ksemendra having the capture of Madanamaucukī at a prior time involves himself into incongruities and impairs the reputation of his hero. When the Vidyadhara Manasavegi carried her off through the air he had rushed her from her apartments in the palace of Kauṣambi. In this point both Sanskrit redactions are in accordance. Her disappearance could in no way be hidden from the father of Naravahanadatta the lord of Kauṣambi. But in the Bṛhatkathamanjari the rape is narrated in lamb VIII (p. 214 f.) yet it is as late as the commencement of lamb XIII (p. 150) that Udayana is informed of his son's distress and of his absence in search of her! <sup>1</sup>) Ks had forgotten that Madanamaucukī was seized at Kauṣambi from the immediate vicinity of her father-in-law.

The lamb „Çiṅkavati which in Bikkh — where it is in IX — is subsequent to the disappearance of Madanamaucukī opens with the nocturnal visit of Iṣṭhalocana who carries the hero while asleep away to a fir cliff hill desirous of his embrace. In the mean while Naravahanadatta awoke and seeing the beautiful heavenly maiden at his side the cunning prince pretended to be asleep.

) at ā t k ā r yā a i j at prā j a i ahi t aya Pa ca  
i t ā lehi rat āro V tadyat p jāsakhat || 1 2  
to allatā jayānta j it ā i ta vare r t  
l j a a sah de lhyā gāyatrī ka arel 11 ||

In cl I ha e corrected the nonsensical reading of the edited text / bharī



difficult to show that Ks's division is not consistent with the regular course of the facts. The lambaka Ratnaprabhā presupposes the heir apparent living with his father at Kauṣambi and his being dependent on him: he has not yet obtained the powers of the Vidyādhari: his falling in love with the Vidyadhari Ratnaprabhā affords the first opportunity to him to be raised into the higher spheres: his love with Karpurika concerns a human lady and it is only by means of a mechanical implement wrought by a human magician that he passes through the air to her distant country and comes back with her home. These facts are properly put between lamb

Madanamaruṇḍa (Somadeva's VI) <sup>1)</sup> treating of how he got his first wife and lamb Alankaravati in which he gains his second Vidyādhari (Somadeva's IX) and becomes more and more familiarized with the spheres on high. But being inserted as Ksemendra does after the lambaka Pura (Somadeva's XIV = Ks's XIII) the facts are utterly discordant. Nor is this arrangement suitable with respect to the lambaka next in Ksemendra which is Ahin Kuravati: it destroys the natural connexion and coherence of lamb Pura and lamb Mahabhiseka (Som's XIV and XV) the victory of the hero and his being anointed as the Cakravartin of the Vidyādhars.

Ks's lamb VIII is Vela which is lamb XI of Somadeva. In this book a very short one Naray obtains as his wife Jinendrasena (Ks) or Jivendrasena (Som) the sister of the two brothers who chose him to pass the judgment of their contest. By fixing the time of that marriage next to his marriage with his first queen Madanamaruṇḍa Ksemendra raises the lady to a higher rank than is consistent with the intention of the author of the Bilatkhali who evidently considered Ratnaprabhā and no other woman as the second queen: the relation of the father to Viśvadev and Padmavati has its parallel in that of the son to Madanamaruṇḍa and Ratnaprabhā. Here too it is plain Ksemendra's arrangement of the order of events is rather anomalous.

The lamb Pura is almost entirely concerned with the frame story. In the Kathasaritsaṅgar of which it is the XIV<sup>th</sup> lamb it begins with the rape of Madanamaruṇḍa and the desolation of her husband: it tells her loss: the various adventures connected with her inquiries after her and the endeavours taken to rescue her from the hands of Manusaka are narrated in the book. Ksemendra's

<sup>1)</sup> Ks's lamb VIII "Saryaprabhā" is a mere episode and does not belong to the frame story of the story.

XIII<sup>th</sup> book „Pañca” has exactly the same contents, with one exception: the rape of Madanamañcukā is not told there, nor could it be told at this point of the tale, since this occurrence was related in an earlier portion of the tale, at the conclusion of the lamb „Velā” In other words: Kṣ. makes Mānasavega kidnap the chief queen of Naravāhanadatta soon after his marrying his second wife, whereas Som. postpones the capture to a much later period of his exploits Both the rape and the *faits et gestes* performed by the future Emperor of the Vidyādhara to recover his beloved one are related without interruption in the Kathāsaritsāgara, within the limits of one lambaka In the Brhatkathāmāñjarī Madanamañcukā is stolen away in lamb. VIII, and not regained before the poem has almost completed lamb XIII The importance of this discrepancy becomes striking, if we consider that the intermediate lambakas, one of which „Çaṣāṅkavati” (Kṣ’s nr. IX) numbers 2435 śloka, are crammed with a great mass of stories of the most various kind, which intercept the main story It is obvious even to a superficial observer that the arrangement of Somadeva is more suitable for a proper exposition of this part of the tale

Moreover, Kṣemendia fixing the capture of Madanamañcukā at a prior time involves himself into incongruities and impairs the reputation of his hero. When the Vidyādhara Mānasavega carried her off through the air, he had ravished her from her apartments in the palace of Kauṣāmbī. In this point both Sanskrit redactions are in accordance Her disappearance could in no way be hidden from the father of Naravāhanadatta, the lord of Kauṣāmbī But in the Brhatkathāmāñjarī the rape is narrated in lamb VIII (p. 214 f.), yet it is as late as the commencement of lamb XIII (p. 450) that Ikṣvāku is informed of his son’s distress and of his absence in search of her! <sup>1)</sup> Kṣ. had forgotten that Madanamañcukā was seized at Kauṣāmbī, from the immediate vicinity of her father-in-law

The lamb „Çaṣāṅkavati”, which in Brhkm — where it is in IX — is subsequent to the disappearance of Madanamañcukā, opens with the nocturnal visit of Lahtalocmā who carries the hero while asleep away to a far off hill, desirous of his embraces In the mean while Naravāhanadatta awoke, and seeing the beautiful heavenly maiden at his side, „the cunning prince pretended to be asleep,

<sup>1)</sup> *atīrṇtāṣe kṣāpi yānam punah prāptam athātmanajam* Kāra,  
*dr̥ṣṭā lebbe ratim tno Vatsarājah piṇja akhah* çl 2  
*tam vallabhānyogāntim jñātā Vatsanareṣṭarah*  
*l d hāsa saha deṣibhyām rokapaṇālamareṣṭrah*

In çl 2 I have corrected the nonsensical reading of the edited text *lobharatim*

and in order to test her he said, as if talking in his sleep  
Where are you, dear Madanamaricukā? Come and embrace me <sup>1)</sup>  
Whereupon she took the form of that queen and complied to his  
wish. Now, both authors agree about the attitude of the prince at  
that moment, he knows the woman who has taken him into her  
arms to be another than his most beloved queen but he feigns it  
is she, in order to prompt her to give him her caresses. This agree-  
ment evidently shows, that the fact was related in this manner in  
their common source, the *Prācīn Brhatkātha*. But how different  
are the circumstances in both Sanskrit redactions! Somadeva simply  
relates the witty trick of a wanton youth, enjoying the *bonne*  
*fortune* of a new love-adventure. Ksemendra strikes the reader  
with the disgusting heartlessness of his hero who just now was  
bereaved of his most beloved wife and in the name of his grief  
employs her cherished name as an instrument for indulging into  
lasciviousness!

The foresaid considerations induce me to conclude that it was  
Somadeva, and not Ksemendra, who drew up the faithful repro-  
duction of the old *Prācīn* poem. That he tells sometimes the same  
story twice over now and then even with slight variations, may  
be put rather on the account of his fidelity in rendering the work  
he wished to preserve than on that of the 'Unachtsamkeit' fancied  
by Mankowski. Who knows both cannot but feel convinced that  
negligence is not a fault of Somadeva but rather of his predecessor.  
And for what reason should we mistrust the explicit declaration  
made in the opening verses of the *Kathasaritsagara*? On the other  
hand it is *a priori* to be expected that Ksemendra not having  
obliged himself to reproduce in a Sanskrit imitation the *Prācīn*  
*Brhatkātha* exactly and in the same order reserved and returned  
his freedom for change and modification according to his own taste.  
It is in consequence of his predilection for regular schemes that  
the adventures and exploits of the two human persons who obtained  
power in the world of the *Vidyādhara*s *Cakravartin* and *Suryaprabhā*  
are narrated in the *Brhatkāthamāyānā* in immediate order in two  
subsequent *lambikās*. The same tendency induced him to put together  
into one body the tales of the *Pāncatantra* (p. 561—587 of the  
printed text), though in the poem he worked upon he found the  
several books separated from each other by interposed small stories  
of a quite different kind. Here and elsewhere it is not he but  
Somadeva who returned the old divisions of the *Brhatkātha*.

<sup>1)</sup> I quote Tawney's translation (II p. 133) of *Kathas* 64. 10

The rightness of this view is confirmed by the following fact : In several cases it is almost certain or at least probable that Ksemendra modified details which he found in the Brhatkathā if in some other source within his reach the same story was related in a somewhat different manner more conformable to his own taste. So it is well nigh proved by J. HERTEL *Ueber das Jantrakhyana die Jasnirische Redaction des Paucatantra*<sup>1)</sup> that his epitome of the Paucatantra (Iamb. XVI cl 256—566) contains many indications of his having made use of that redaction of the renowned book by side with its reproduction in Guṇadhya's Brhatkathā. It is from the former work that he took the name of the town Mihilaropya (cl 256 and 392) which is not found in Somadeva but occurs in the Jantrakhyāṇa being likewise written *Miṛṭa*<sup>2)</sup> (cp Hertel p 118). It is by misunderstanding the description of the spectacle afforded to the eyes of the people when the tortoise was being carried away through the air seizing with his teeth a piece of wood the ends of which were caught by two swans that Ksemendra writes *śakatiḥṭṭu* (cl 334) — his source has *śuṣṭaśalatacīḥapranīṣaśaśyalaśyalaśaśa* (l 735 of Hertel's ed.) cp Hertel p 109. Nor is it likely that the fable of the sly jackal Caturāṅga (cl 348 foll.) was contained in the Brhatkathā; it is not met with in Kathasaritsagara but occurs in *Jantra* l 759 foll. The same may apply to the stories of the crow and the serpent of the blue jaelal and of the camel who was compelled to smother his body to the lion. Cp also Hertel's note on p 132.

The Vetula stories are no less popular in India than the fables of the Paucatantra. They too have come to us in many redactions. Ksemendra composing the Vetula portion of the Brhatkathā must have taken his materials not from Guṇadhya's poem alone but have availed himself also of other redactions. Certainly he took delight in the old Vetulapimāṇṣatikathās. He is more extensive in this part of his poem than he is wont to be and did not abridge them to that kind of skeleton as to which he reduced the old Paucatantra. His epitome of the Vetula tales numbers 1203 ślokaś (from IX 18 p 289 — to IX 1221 p 385 of the edited text) whereas no more than 308 make up the sum of his Paucatantra portion. The arrangement of the tales is slightly different in Katha and in Brhatkathā both agree as to nr 1—4 but Ksem in 5 = Som nr 4 Ksem in 6 7 8 = Som nr 5 6 7 from nr 9 they are again

<sup>1)</sup> This important dissertation (Leipzig Teubner 1901) which contains all the oldest redactions of the Paucatantra known to us is XVII nr 5 of the *Abhandlungen der phil. hist. Klasse der Königl. Preussischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*.

in accordance. Now, nr 5 of Kṣem is also nr 5 in Jivānanda's edition of the *Vetālaparicayam* 1), the story of the three fastidious brothers. After all which has been exposed above, I hold it for certain that it was Kṣemendra, and not Somadeva, who changed the order of the tales as they were extant in the *Bhṛatkaṭhā*, and who modified some details. With him, Vīravara's devotion to Hara and Hara's double as expensive as in the *Kathīs* (cp *Brhkm* p 310, 282 f with *Kathās* 78, 16—18), it is he who added the getting with child of Čaṣiprabhā in tale nr 15 (p 347, śl 747 and p 349 śl 760), in tale nr 17 the person of Virāṇa, to whom the king avows his being in love, is not found in *Kathās*, in nr 18, when Candrisāmin after submerging into the river, experiences another life existence, the events of that submarine life are full of particularities, which are not met with in the correspondent part of *Kathīs* (cp *Kathās* 92, 65—67 with *Brhkm* p 367, śl 992—999) but which occur also in nr 15 of Jivānanda's edition (p 52 f), the third *vetīla*, in Kṣemendra's poem, contains likewise sundry details not found in *Kathīs* *Vet* nr 3, and extends over 76 ślokaś (p 302, 181—308, 259). Thus diversity in some respects is utterly contrasting with the great conformity as to the transitions of one number of the *Vetīla* tales to another, e.g. the transition of tale nr 3 to nr 4

*Brhkm* p 308, śl 260

*muktattakūśam ādāya tatas tam  
gataśambhramah | yayau jayena  
nrpatih śkandhaśthah so 'py  
abhūśata ||*

261 *mohah prthivīpate ho' yam  
taiṇpi hīdi jumbhate | dastaśra-  
manasaṃparkād yat prāpto 'si  
mahim imām ||*

262 *anayāsam hi patheyam  
yathesam kathanaṃ pathi |*

*Kathās* 78, 2

*labdhīṃ muktattakūśam tam Pe-  
talam urṣarogam | nīkompah  
śkandham aropya taṣṇim kda-  
calat tatah ||*

3 *calantam ca tam amsastho  
Petulak so 'brahmapurak | rajan  
kubhikṣor etaya kīte ho' yam  
tata śramah ||*

4 *āyāse nīphale 'mṛsimin nīelo  
bata nūstī te tad imām śrau-  
matas tām kathām pathi  
imodimim ||*

Therefore, where this conformity is broken by Ks producing more and somewhat different details, we may as a rule suppose

1) A very bad edition of an ep tome of the work, made by a certain Jambhalaṭṭa Č. Uhle in his Preface (p VI) on his edition of (ivānanda's *Vetālaparicayam* atika (11h f d e k ante les *Varṣatāntas* *Varṣatāntas* d D Morgent Ges VIII, nr 1)

that he made use there of other sources besides the Bṛhatkathā<sup>1</sup>

The old epic legend of Nala and Damayanti is told in the 56<sup>th</sup> tat of the Kathāsamitsāgara, çl 238—417, the corresponding passage in Brhm (p 537, çl 331—540, çl 371) amounts to  $\frac{2}{9}$  of its length. Yet it mentions the boons, given by the devas at Nala's marriage (çl 342), which detail is passed over by Somadeva. The very words, which Kṣ uses here

*chāyādvṛtīyam avrot parijñaya Nalam dhīyā  
jñātvā devāḥ svam ākaram vidhāya pradadur varām*

show that he availed himself of the original Mahābhārata tradition, too, not only of the Bṛhatkathā<sup>1</sup>). For this reason, too, he avoided to state that she saw six Nalas, as he found in the Puṣkai poem, contrarily to the Mbh, the Nalopākhyāna, adhy 5, 9 has „five“ Nalas<sup>2</sup>), Kṣ does not name any number at all. Nor did he find in the Bṛhatkathā, that Puṣkara was a relative to Nala, not a brother (*sagotrenatha çatruṇā / kenōpi Puṣkarāḥkhyena*), which is also different from the Mbh, I do not understand, for what reason he may have modified this, and am rather inclined to suspect some neglect of his part.

Another instance of Kṣemendra's freedom in handling his ground work. The story of Purūras and Urvāci is told in both Sanskrit versions. In the Kathā (17, 4) Purūras is called *paramaśaśanata*, and from the whole style and spirit of the story of his adventures it is plain that the version of the Bṛhatkathā is founded on a Viṣṇuic recension of the old myth. Kṣemendra stripped off entirely that Viṣṇu garb, and in his short extract (lamb III, 114—123) he purposely does not even mention the name of Viṣṇu, though this god plays an *essential* part in the story as told by Somadeva.

Elsewhere Kṣemendra, who loved to show his learning, gratifies himself in additional ornaments of a rather ostentatious character. If such accessories are not found at all in the parallel passages of Kathā and at the same time display that the poet was well read in the great epics and the purāṇa literature, it is likely that he has added them of his own. Of the kind is this Bhūmabhṛta is

<sup>1</sup>) The force of this argument will be felt by every one who, perusing the Nala episode in the Kathā, observes how much its composer strove to keep a wording different from that of the famous epic tale.

<sup>2</sup>) In Kathā 56, 200—280 the narration of the wooing of Damayanti by the Devas is a paraphrase of the simpler account in Mbh. It differs in this, that six lokajñās, not four, come up to the svayamvara, Vāya being added to Indra, Agni, Varuna and Yama, see çl 261.

changed into an elephant owing to a curse of a hermit whom he had treated with contempt. In Kathās (74, 305) that hermit's name Uttanka is simply mentioned, nothing more. Kṣemendra does not omit to identify him with the Uttanka of the Ādiparva of the Mhbh (see p. 286, cf. 572).

To infer from all this that *wheresoever*, with respect to the contents of the corresponding tales, Kṣemendra is at variance with Somadeva, he has modified them either from other sources or by his own invention, would be, however, a very hasty conclusion and rather an untruth. Since both abridged a voluminous ground-text independently, it cannot have failed to happen that some details passed over by one were drawn up by the other, even while taking into account that the result of Kṣemendra's condensing effort was the production of a poem much smaller than that of Somadeva.<sup>1)</sup> BÜHLER, in his first article mentioned above p. 11, demonstrated already that variance in particularities may, and in some cases, must be explained so. I may point to the fact that Kṣemendra avoids more than the author of Kathās introducing anonymous persons, he has a childish liking for the proper names of the dramatic personae of his numerous tales, nor is it anything rare with him that, within shorter limits, he mentions names of secondary persons not found in the corresponding parties of Somadeva.<sup>2)</sup>

Recapitulating, we may state as the main result of the comparison of the two Sanskrit redactions thus, that Somadeva's poem may be considered to give a faithful representation of the old Pañcālī Brhatkathā, but that on the other hand the differences between him and Kṣemendra are not always to be imputed to the latter having contaminated the tradition of the Brhatkathā with trims and

<sup>1)</sup> So it is impossible that the details of the story told Brhkm p. 406, cf. 57 59 but passed over Kathās 123, 310, did not belong to the Brhatkathā. In Kathās. 100 68 it is simply said that it was in her old father's hermitage that Vegavati succeeded in getting the *utrus*, denegated to her by her brother, Brhkm p. 403, cf. 41—49 contains a detailed account how this came to happen. Whence else could he draw it is than from the Brhatkathā? And the agreement mentioned by Kṣem. (f. 168 cf. 122) *Idāni prajāntīdāni na rājann ite vamsīlā*, as it is doubtless an essential feature of the story of Suena and Rambhā, goes back to the Pañcālī original, though Kṣem. did not retain it in his version (t. 2<sup>o</sup>, 60 foll).

<sup>2)</sup> To give a few instances out of a large list Kṣ. names — Som not — the mother of Rutāhī, the yoginī who taught the pseudo-hermit savali an incantation against the fever demon, the wife of Jīmatiletu the king of Ujjayini in the preamble of the story of Nacavadata, the maiden whom Ivaracerman married at last (cf. Brhkm p. 211, 196 216, 380 311, 718 491, 103 517, 79 with Kathās 70, cf. 71, 307 40, 6—9 37, 5, 17). A remarkable name is that of the captain of the ship Ibarā: it does not occur in Somadeva's relation of the sleeping mixe (t. 2<sup>o</sup>, 77 foll).

particulars taken from other redactions of the same stories or to his having given free play to his own fancy. Sometimes he may have done so, yet he kept sometimes peculiarities originally belonging to the Brhatkātha which Somadeva left aside. Sound inquiry must decide thereabout in each separate case, not rarely, I fear, its conclusion will be *non liquet*. But, be this as it may, there is not the least reason to distrust the categorical declaration of the author of the Kathasāritsāgar, that his shortened Brhatkāthā in Sanskrit is the faithful reproduction of the Puṇḍarī poem, without detracting or adding to its contents. It was he who kept the original order of the lambāṇas and not Kṣemendin. The different arrangement of the latter is to be ascribed to some caprice. And so the final conclusion of our general inquiry tends to confirm if not to enlarge the value of the Kathasāritsāgar as the trustworthy testimony of that immense mass of fairy tales which was collected many centuries before the eleventh A. D. and as a faithful picture of Indian society at the time, when that collection was made.

In 1693 the existence of a third Sanskrit *samgraha* of the Brhatkāthā was made known. The pundit Hara Prasad Shastri in an article of the *Journal of the As Soc of Bengal* (LVII, 215 foll.) gave an account of the contents of a MS. he had received through the good offices of some friend from Nepal among a collection of old and fragmentary Sanskrit literary documents. That MS. nr. 12 of his list was labelled as unknown but on examination he discovered it to be a portion of a Sanskrit redaction of the Brhatkāthā much different from both Somadeva's and Kṣemendri's and in his opinion a more extensive work than even the former of both. 'To give an idea of the length of the whole he noticed that the first adhyaṃya alone distributed over 26 sargas has more than 1200 ślokas, which portion he estimated about a tenth of the whole work.' It is not divided so he said into lambikās and tārāṅgīs but into adhyaṃyas and sargas. He added in full the colophons of the different sargas extant in the fragment he had discovered. This valuable statement must be corrected in one point, as has been observed by Dr Hertel, in the Preface of his edition of the meridional redaction of Pāṇinīyāy<sup>1)</sup> p. VII—VIII. Hara Prasad had misunderstood the meaning of *adhyaṃya* occurring but once and without the addition of *prāṭham* in the colophons. Our fragment knows no other division but into sargas.

<sup>1)</sup> *Abh. de Soci. des. Sci. Ind. de l'Inde*, Pl. I Hist. Cl. XLIV, nr. 5.



the word *adhyāya* is not the name of some portion of the poem. The title of the whole, as found in the colophons, is *Brhatkathāyām ślokaśamgraha* = „the abstract in ślokas (called) *Brhatkathā*”

Five years after, Sylvain Lévi returning from Nepal took to Paris another manuscript of the same work, more exactly speaking, a second MS which contains a portion of the text, brought into light by Hara Prasād, sarga 1—10 out of the 26. Though this acquisition did not extend the compass of the remnants of the third Sanskrit *Brhatkathā*, it drew the attention to that work. One of Lévi's pupils, M. FRÉDÉRIC LACÔTE, to whom he intrusted the study of it and in whose behalf he obtained the loan of the Calcutta MS described by Hara Prasād, is now preparing an edition. He has already published in original and translation the first sarga in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1906 (Janv.—Févr. p. 22 foll.) and in the general account he gives of the work, he fully subscribes to the judgment of the first discoverer: „Nous avons affaire à un poème complètement différent”, if compared with the common source of the two Kashmirian abbreviators. As far as may be inferred from the fragment available, not only „la disposition des matières”, but also „en grande partie, les matières mêmes sont tout autres”. The first sarga certainly has a content not found at all in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* nor in the *Brhatkathā-mañjarī*, and even not consistent with what is related in a few ślokas of *Kathīs* (111, 81. 90—93) about Gopālakī's abdication and depart to the forest. And the examination of the colophons communicated by Hara Prasād sometimes brings us in contact with names and facts known from *Katbas* and *Bṛhatk*, as the story of Pīṅgalikā (*Kathās* t. 21), the hero's marriage with Vegavatī and Gandhāradattī (*Kathās* I. 105 and 106), sometimes on the contrary we meet with persons not occurring there, as Pīyadāśarṇvā, the lady whose name is found in the colophons of sarga 20 and 22—26.

Further, M. Lacôte observes that the whole plan of composition of the „*Brhatkathā ślokaśamgraha*” is quite different: „Il ne se compose pas d'une collection de contes variés. Le souci de l'ordre et de la composition y est évident, le sujet y est exactement limité, sans doute les héros y racontent des histoires, mais ce sont contes, sinon brefs, du moins étroitement liés à l'action et mieux fondus dans le récit” (II p. 31).

M. Lacôte proposes to take up the question of the interrelation of the two different *Brhatkathās* together with his edition of the *ślokaśamgraha*. We for our part, as we are dealing with the *Brhat-*

kāthā as the source of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and since there can be no doubt as to which reduction of the Bṛhatkāthā underlies the poems of Somadeva and Kṣemendra, leave this point awaiting for the rest with great interest the results of Lacôte's investigations. In the following Chapter, however, the nature of the facts and questions examined there, will oblige us to make known our preliminary opinion about that interrelation, as far as it has been fixed by the data as yet available.

---

## CHAPTER III

### THE BRHĀTKATHA ITS DATE AND ITS AUTHOR

When was the Brhātkatha composed?

The question is answered differently by competent scholars. WIEBER in the 2<sup>d</sup> ed. of his *Indische Literaturgeschichte*, in 1876 said hesitatingly (p. 229, n. 224) 'aus etwa dem sechsten (?) Jahrhund.' BÖHLER in his *Detailed Report of a Tour in Kashmir* which appeared one year after, peremptorily pronounced 'Gunādhya's Vrihātkathā goes back to the first or second century of our era.' SILLIMAN LEW in his *Theatre indien* 1891 (p. 317 at the bottom) preferred a date between both limits but nearer to that fixed by Böhler. L. Autenr de la Brhātkathā puṣaṭi qui vivait avant la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle (Subindhu le cite à cette époque) et probablement au III<sup>e</sup>.) And a few years ago VINCENT A. SMITH in an article on *Andhra History and Coinage* in the *Zeitschr. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.*, concluded that the original Brhātkathā in the Pāṇini Dialect the Saptasatī in Viharastī and the Katantrī grammar are all to be referred to the approximate date, 60 or 70 A.D. (*DMG* LVI, 660). So the work the reputed author of which is Gunādhya is assigned to dates, ranging over a period of five centuries.

The *terminus ante quem* is not uncertain. It is a matter of fact that Bana, who quotes the Brhātkathā in the preamble of his *Harsacarita*, lived in the first part of the seventh century. Also that Subindhu who wrote the *Vaṇadatta* precedes Bana in time. He too alludes more than once at the Brhātkathā. Placing his lifetime as is usually done in the sixth century, the necessary inference is this, that our Pūṇi poem was renowned at a date nearly contemporaneous with his time.

As to the *terminus ex quo* this cannot at any rate be placed before the beginning of our era. The original Brhātkathā must be posterior to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana Vāmanai by several centuries: the persons of both grammarians occur in the main stories of the

\*) In 1905 the same scholar prefers the 2<sup>d</sup> century, see his *Le Nepal* II. 63.

first lambaka, the Kathāpitha, where Vararuci is no other than the guru Puṣpadanta in his human existence, to which he had been condemned by a curse (vid *supra*, p 1) The fabulous things told about him are so wonderful that at the first acquaintance with the Kathāsamītiāgāra it was universally accepted that there must be a considerable space of time between the age of the real Vararuci and the putting to writing of the legendary stories recorded in the Kathāpitha. Nobody, therefore, has ventured to assign to the Pañcāli poem any earlier date than the first century A D Bühler, whose high authority makes his statement (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>d</sup> century) be accepted by most scholars<sup>1)</sup>, came to this conclusion upon general considerations, it seems Vincent A Smith, circumscribing the time of its composition within the limits of the third quarter of the first century A D, follows this line of argument. His starting point is the Udayagiri rock inscription of king Kharavela of Kalinga, dated of the 165<sup>th</sup> year of the Maurya era. We learn from it that in 168 B C that monarch was assisted by his ally Çatākini [or Sītākini] whose realm was in the West — *abhitūyita Satahama pachamadisa*<sup>2)</sup>. By combining other epigraphical and literary data (*ZDMG*, 11 p 653 foll.) it may be inferred that the Çatākini dynasty who reigned over the Andhira state west of Kalinga, was established 220 B C and lasted until the middle of the second century A D. Since the oldest Purāṇas especially the Vāyu and the Matsya, contain lists of the Andhira kings with the number of years of their reigns it is easy to find by computation that Hāla, the 18<sup>th</sup> of the Matsya purāṇa list, must have acceded in or about 68 A D according to the Matsya and in or about 51 A D, according to the Vāyu Purāṇa (ibid p 659)<sup>3)</sup>. This Hāla, also known by his other name Satavakana<sup>4)</sup>, is that monarch who is 'credited by tradition with the patronage of three important literary works' the anthology of Mahārūṣṭra stanzas, known

<sup>1)</sup> See e.g. Pischel, *Grammatische Prakritsprachen*, § 29, Macdonnell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p 376.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. BHARGAVATĪ INDRĀNIS paper in the *Actes du 6<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Congress of London) espec p 146.

<sup>3)</sup> Vincent A Smith quotes, not from the text of the Matsya-purāṇa, but from Radcliff's testimony. The list is found in ch 273. In the edition, I have at hand, brought into light by care of Pt. cinema Tarkaratna (Calcutta, 1890), neither the number of the kings, nor their names and the length of their reigns do fully agree with the list as published in *ZDMG*, 11. As long as we do not possess critical editions of the most prominent Purāṇas, it should not be lost of sight, that the exactness of their data needs requires philological test before using them.

<sup>4)</sup> I follow the spelling of PW and of Durgapāli in his ed. of the Kathas. Smith spells Sataśāhana.

as Hāla's *Sattasāī*, the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇādhyā, who was minister of *Sītarāhara*, and the *Kātantra* whose author *Ṣarvavarmān* is recorded to have been another minister of the same king. Taking his conclusion, Smith infers that the three works are contemporaneous and must be placed about 60—70 A. D.

The argument is specious indeed, but I think it is rather weak by its onesidedness. If its inventor had considered also the literary side of the problem, more than one objection would have presented itself to his mind. WEBER, in the preface on his edition of the *Sattasāī*, which appeared in the *Abhandl. of the Deutsche Morgenl. Ges.* (VII, nr. 4. Ueber das Saptasatākam des Hāla) demonstrated from words as *horā* = *क्षर*, *amgaratūra* = *तुन्दर*, and some words of Persian origin occurring in that work, that it is impossible to place the collection which bears the name of *Sītarāhara* before the 3<sup>d</sup> century of our era, and expressed as his own opinion that it is rather to be ascribed to a later time, of course before *Bana* (7<sup>th</sup> cent.) who praised the anthology in the preamble of his *Harsacarita*. He who holds a different opinion is bound to infirm the strong arguments put forward in that dissertation. Vincent A. Smith did not so, and I greatly doubt how he should be able to prove an as early date as he does of a collection of verses, in which *horā* and *amgaratūra* are used as they are.

Then, if the *Pañcaci* tongue belongs to the North-western border of India, as is the opinion of Grierson, it looks strange that the birthplace of a standard work of enormous size in that dialect is sought for in a country at so great a distance from those regions. As easy as it is to understand that a ruler of Maratha land praises for the reputed author of the famous anthology of *Maharīstri* poets<sup>1)</sup>, is little advisable is it to believe in an historical basis of the legendary account of *Sītarāhara* acting as the propagator of Guṇādhyā's poem. Though no work in *Pañcaci* has come to us, that language must have had a considerable literature. WASNIAW

<sup>1)</sup> GARRET, in his compte rendu of a former article of Weber on the *Saptasatāka* in *Journal Asiatique* Ser. 8. t. XX. 199, says of the tradition that it is trustworthy as far as, elle attribue une collection de poésies malavādī à un roi des Malavāstra.

As to the historical foundation of that tradition I quote with my full assent the following words of the same scholar (p. 199) „Hāla, d'après le témoignage unanime du lexicographe Hemacandra, des commentateurs, de Colebrooke et de Phan Dīgi est un nom de Kalabhāna ou Śatavāhana, ce qui n'oblige certainement pas à admettre sans contrôle que ce personnage aussi légendaire qu'historique ait effectivement recueilli ou fait recueillir les vers en question”, and *ibid.* p. 207 „Sans accepter cette identification [of Hāla and Śatavā] comme un fait historique, nous avons le droit d'y voir l'expression de l'opinion des Indiens, opinion qui a ni plus ni moins de valeur que celle qui rattache à Vikramāditya les œuvres les plus célèbres de la littérature sanskrite”.

records in his work on Buddhism (p. 295 of the German translation, cp. *ibid.* p. 226, n. 3) from Tibetan sources that one of the chief schools of the Vaiśhāṅikas, the Sthāviras employed the Paṣācī. If we consider that Buddhism flourished in the regions, where Paṣācī seems to be at home, this testimony seems to be trustworthy. If the legend about Guṇādhyā being compelled by his vow to use that tongue teaches us anything real, it is this that the Paṣācī was not considered a current language within India proper. In no other wise may it be explained that Guṇādhyā, taking the vow of *maṇḍa*, if Śaivavarman succeeded to make a learned man out of the ignorant king in a minimum of time, engaged himself to never more use any of the three languages Sanskrit, Pāṭikrī, Apabhraṃṣa, excluding the fourth, the Paṣācī. Apparently, in the mind of the composer of the tale that language is considered a foreign tongue. This remark makes it more than doubtful that a Mahārāṣṭra king should have anything to do with the composition of the Paṣācī *Bṛhatkathā*. It is not an old historical tradition but the popularity of his name, that fathered on him its first lambika.

Further, assuming for a moment that Vincent A. Smith is right taking the *Kathāpithi* for a document of some historical value, be it even so little, and also right in his fixation of the reign of the Andhra king Hāla = Śatavāhana in the time of the emperor Nero, I wonder how he did not realize the enormous anachronisms effected by combining this double evidence. The Śatavāhana of the *Bṛhatkathā*, king of the country Pratiśṭhāna, the capital of which is Supratisthita<sup>1)</sup>, being coeval with the last Nandas and Candragupta, belongs accordingly to the end of the IV<sup>th</sup> century B.C. That he must be a contemporary of them is a necessary inference from what is narrated in the *Kathāpithi*. Puṣpadanta-Varanuci and Māhivanti-Guṇādhyā were caused together, they commenced then human existence at the same time. Now, Varanuci was the minister of the last Nanda, Guṇādhyā of Śatavāhana. Ergo the legendary last Nanda and his destroyer Candragupta are placed in the same time as the legendary king Śatavāhana, born out of a lioness and made by adoption son to king Dipikarni. But the historical persons of that name are separated in Vincent A. Smith's own chronology by at least three centuries and a half. Considering, then, the so called data of the *Kathāsaritsāgarā* somewhat more closely, we sink again „in the quicksands of Sanskrit literary history,” to use the image

<sup>1)</sup> See *Kathās* 6, 8 *Pratiśṭhāne 'stī nāgarāṇi Sūratisthita mahānāgaṇi*.

of Vincent A Smith himself (*ZMDG* 11 p 660) and have no resting-place I pass over the difficulty that the names of the predecessor of the legendary and the historical Sātavāhana disagree (Dīpakarm and Riktavarna<sup>1</sup>) [*Matsyapur adhy* 273, çl 9]], as this point is of minor importance

Therefore, we are constrained to place the book which records the miraculous things related about Sātavāhana and pretends to be composed by Sātavāhana himself (*Kathās* 8, 37) in a very long time after the historical Sātavāhana Placing this king as Vincent A Smith does, in the third quarter of the 1<sup>st</sup> century A D, it will be impossible to claim for the *Kathāpīṭha*, and consequently, for the *Bṛhatkathā* a date earlier than the third century of our era, the date fixed by Sylvain Lévi

This much we have got from the *Kathāpīṭha* But other useful intelligence is to be found in other parts of the great poem hitherto unobserved or forgotten, I believe, with the help of which the approximate date may be settled somewhat more exactly Bühler's estimation must certainly be given up

First of all I remind of the important fact that in the *Jambhaka Ratnaprabhā* (VII of *Som*, XIV of *Ksem*) there is a miraculous story about the great Nāgārjuna (*Kathās* 41, 9—58, *Bṛhkm* p 500, çl 392—407) That it is the famous Buddhist theologian of that name and no other who is the hero of the tale is palpable as well by his being styled *Bodhisattvācāryasambhāra* (*Kathās* 41, 10) as by the nature of his exploits The historical Nāgārjuna belongs doubtless to a later period than the Sātavāhana of Vincent A Smith KERN, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p 118, places him  $\pm$  150 A D, *Tirānīṭha* treats of his deeds and his immense knowledge after completing his relation of Kāṁska and the Third Council, at which time Buddhist tradition places the birth of Nāgārjuna Arguing as before and leaving ever so much room for the promptness of devotees to endow the divine master and Bodhisattva, as they will have considered him already during his lifetime, with miraculous and superhuman powers, yet the extremely wonderful story told about him presupposes a distance of time of at least one century Accordingly, our *terminus ex quo* for the date of the *Bṛhatkathā* advances to the latter half of the third century A D at the utmost, and it begins to be likely that its composition cannot be dated before 300 A D

<sup>1</sup> I find the name in the printed text, mentioned *supra* Radcliff, who is the source of Smith, names this king Gorakṣasāgari or Gaurakṣa, Naurakṣa, Vikṣa. We have here a fair sample of how much MSS may disagree in Paurāṇik texts!





above, is recognizable, too, in the Avadānaśataka if compared with the Avadānamālā, which contain paraphrases of edifying tales belonging to the Avadānaśataka.<sup>1)</sup> The use of the betel after dinner is regular in those younger texts, but it is never mentioned in the older work which has been paraphrased by them. The strength of the argumentum ex silentio is unimpeachable here, for the *same* relations of dinners offered to Buddha the Lord are without betel in the Avadānaśataka and with betel in the Avadānamālā.

Applying, then, the criterion of the *tumbula* to our inquiry after the date of composition of the Bṛhatkathā, the story of Migāṇkadatta can scarcely have been invented, or at least have been put on the form in which it is related in the Great Tale, before the fourth century A.D. at the lowest rate. And taking into account that this whole episode of Migāṇkadatta is not an invention of the composer of the Bṛhatkathā, but that he included it within his compilation, that, therefore, it must have existed already as an independent composition in his days — we will not be far from truth, I believe, concluding from this that the Bṛhatkathā itself can be placed in no manner before the fifth century.

The strength of this reasoning is supported by another consideration. Bina in the preface of his Harṣacarita, praisingly names the great authors in whose steps he ventures to tread. He extols as models of excellent poetry in eight ślokas as many renowned works among them the Vasavadattā (of Subhūdhī), Śāntaśhrīrāsa's (= Hāla's) anthology, the Setubandha, the works of Kālidāsa, the nāṭikas of Bhāsa, and also our Bṛhatkathā. The works he admires are both Sanskrit and Prākṛit compositions, and the tone and spirit of this whole passage reminds of the *prastāvana* of the Mālavikāgnimitra, in which young Kālidāsa appeals to the sound judgment of his audience for his literary debut. For this purpose it is not to be expected that he will have taken the standard authors and classical works he praises from so remote antiquity. There can scarcely be allowed a larger track of time between the oldest of them and his own days than two centuries. He does not name Valmiki, and Vyāsa he addresses in quite another connection, in the solemn invocation of deities and rsis, which according to custom opens his book. His naming, then, of the Great Tale, the hero of which is Naraśhrīmadatta, the God of Love born again, not only proves the

<sup>1)</sup> See my paper „Fenige handels van avalanas, stichtelijke verhalen der Noordelyke Biddisten“ (Versl. en Medel. der Kon. Akad. v. Wet. Afd. Lett., IVde Reeks. dl. III)

existence of the Bihatkathī about 600 A D., something beyond discussion, but also makes it probable that the date of its composition cannot be too much remote from that limit.

The date settled, however roughly in this manner will prove useful in its consequences. We obtain by it also some evidence for the time of composition of the *Mudrarakṣas*.

In Kathās 160 the contents of which are identical with those of *Pancatantra* Book I the following śloka occurs (119 ed B1 = 118 ed Durg)

*diṇayoḥ dattapadaḥ su ca tayor neclitayoḥ calaḥ<sup>1</sup>*  
*na caknoti evam sthātum dharmam ekaṃ vimūḥcalaḥ*

= , The helle (*cala*) goddess [she refers to Cṛi named in the preceding śloka], if she places her feet at the same time upon two exalted persons, cannot keep her footing long, she will certainly abandon one of the two (Lawney's transl II, 31). This sentence is a free imitation of a tristubh of Viśvalabdatta, the author of the *Mudrarakṣas*. It is found in the 10th Act of that drama (p 116 of *Majumdar's Series* ed = p 179 ed *Limbik Lalung*)

*atyneclite mantrini parthive ca*  
*ustabhyā padau upatisthate Cṛik*  
*su stustabharat asau bhavasya*  
*tayor diṇayor ekataram jahati*

= If Cṛi [= Fortuna Regia] has to attend a king with a very exalted minister she must take hold on them with her stretched feet placed from another but owing to her womanhood being too weak to keep them she will (soon) abandon one of the two.

Now this self-same tristubh is met with in the *Laṅkā Khyāṭikā* (I, 56) that is the oldest redaction of the *Pancatantra* come down to us and it occurs there at the same point of the tale, yet at the same point of the conversation of Daumika and Pṅgalaka, where Somadeva puts his free imitation of the stanza. Dr Hertel in his edition of the *Laṅkā Khyāṭikā*, has shown that there exists a close connection between that text and the

Pancatantra portion of the *Bṛatkathā* <sup>1)</sup> It follows from this that the double fact of the identity of the *Mudrārākṣasa* tristubh with *Tantrākhy* I, 56 and of the occurrence of the anuṣṭubh imitative of it in Somadeva's poem at the very place where its prototype is met with in *Tantrākhy* cannot be the effect of chance. This alternative may be stated a priori either *Viçikṣadatta* borrowed the stanza from *Panc* respectively from the same authority as *Panc* did, or that oldest recension of *Panc* is younger than the *Mudrārākṣasa*. As to the former member of the alternative, it is expressly stated in *Tantrākhy* that the stanza is a quotation (*sādhucitatā nyate*). So it becomes very improbable that *Viçikṣadatta* took it from *Panc*. Nor is it likely that he took it from any other text. Every one who reads over the scene of *Mudr*, in which the stanza is found, will feel convinced that both the contents and the wording of it are in perfect agreement with the peculiar situation of the context and must have their *original home* there. Hence it follows that *Viçikṣadatta* and his admirable drama are to be placed many centuries earlier than is generally done for a stanza from it was quoted in even that redaction of *Panc*, which was taken up in the *Bṛatkathā*. Since the *Bṛatkathā* must have been composed  $\pm$  400 A D., the date of the *Mudrārākṣasa* is needs to be put at least one generation before that time.

WILSON, as is known was induced by the *bharatavakya* commemorating Alleechris as a cause of fear to India to postpone its composition to the times of the great Mohammedan invasions, still WILSON (*Ind. Literaturg* <sup>2</sup> 224 u. 218) believed it to be „aus etwa dem zwölften Jahrhundert". Subsequent scholars were well aware that neither the spirit of the drama nor the relations and conditions of society and religion as represented in it were suitable to a so late time, but the complete absence of any datum fit for serving as a point of starting to research, and the prejudice of Wilson's estimation which dominated in their minds prevented them from modifying his statement otherwise than by abating it a little and a little lacunae in the second volume of the *Wiener Zeitschrift* very cleverly calculated even the date of the first representation of the *Mudrārākṣasa* Dec. 2 of 560 A D. — but his premises were false, MACDONALD put the *terminus ante quem* on about 800 (*Hist. of Sanskr. Lit.* p. 365). Kishinūth Trimbak Telang in his

<sup>1)</sup> In that recension of the *Panc* which is known as the Southern one and which takes its origin from the *Tantrākhy*, the stanza is likewise found with some modifications. See *Das 5. Uche Pañcatantra, herausgegeben von J. HERTZ* — *quintessenza*, p. 41, note 1 — p. 13.

edition of the play pleaded for the conclusion that it belongs to somewhere about the early part of the eighth century A D (p XXXI) But I think I have proved that it is by four or five centuries older and must rank with the *Mlecchulata* as the two most ancient plays of the Hindu theatre come to us Both dramas are ascribed to authors about whom almost nothing is known but their name Candraśekhara bears even a somewhat mythical character Viśakhadatta whose father and paternal grandfather are named in the prologue of his play may have been a historical person but no tradition whatever concerning him does exist This is wholly consistent with his belonging to a very ancient time

I am inclined to suppose that the Candra Gupta named in the *Maṇaratnaka* of Mudra may be in allusion to some prince of that name who belonged to the dynasty of the Guptas He who is eulogized in that final stanza is a successful protector against the threatening Mlecchas may be Candra Gupta I the founder of the new and national dynasty who lived in the beginning of his glorious descendant Candra Gupta II at the end of the fourth century It would be no matter of wondering if the brilliant exploits especially of the first Candra Gupta who subverted a secular domination of barbarians in the N and N W parts of India had prompted the unknown poet Viśakhadatta to glorify a similar establishment of a mighty national monarchy by the name of his king and by his famous minister This hypothesis which is in congruity with the line of argument I have followed when proceeding from the trustworthy stanza common to Mudra and *Antarāṅghrikā* is not contradicted by the style and language of the play The style is characterized by its relative simplicity the diction is exquisite and some lexicological facts may indicate an ancient date of its composition I g the use of *śaraya* = body in the forged letter (Act V) *śarayaśūmenā* is only met with in Buddhist Sanskrit texts of the first centuries A D and is therefore not registered in the Petrop Dictionary of *parāṇa* (Act III, st 10) = 'religious festival' perhaps of *śarāyā* — not mentioned in the Petri Dict — Act III st 11 see Kashimath's ed p 121 with commentary<sup>1)</sup>

By the bye I remark that it is highly improbable that Viśa

<sup>1)</sup> I am somewhat uncertain about *kalatā* (Act I st 15) If the edited text is *kalatā* this word, which is always a synonym of *śāśa* *śāśa* *śāśa* and may also signify *śāśa* *śāśa* *śāśa*, has here the meaning of family in the largest sense in this case it is very probable that this word may be reckoned an archaism But I greatly doubt the exis-

khadatta, as Sylvain Lévi affirms (*Le théâtre indien*, p. 226), borrowed the subject matter of his *nutaka* from the Brhatkathā „cette source inépuisable” In the poems of Somadeva and Kṣemendra the sole fact of Candragupta's overturn of the Nandas is narrated and in a very concise way, but the events that happened after Candragupta's vengeance and his triumph and conquest of the royalty are not mentioned, nor does the name of Rukṣasa anywhere occur. If nothing is certain, it is this that Viçṭkhadatta did *not* borrow the plot of his drama from the Brhatkathā.

After this digression going back to the main subject of this discussion, we will bring forth now some indications of various kind leading in the same direction to fix the date of the Brhatkathā about  $\pm$  400 A.D. They may also afford some basis for further investigation. For this reason they are put forward. Their demonstrating power, if considered separately, is perhaps not so great but combined, they may help to strengthen the reasoning exposed in the foregoing.

1 The historical tradition of the foundation of Pataliputra must have been fully overgrown with legendary accounts and even wholly forgotten at the time when the Brhatkathā was composed. Passing over the well known marvellous story of the origin of the famous capital of the Mauryas as it is narrated in Kathis 13 and Brhkm p. 10—12, I remark that the author of our collection of tales makes Vasantika and Iṣantika tell stories of events happened in former days (*prāk*) at Pataliputra (see Kathis 17. 64 cp. Brhkm p. 79 ṣl. 136 and Kathis 37. 25 cp. Brhkm p. 341, ṣl. 12). In the mind of him who wrote down this, the new capital of Magadha, of a relatively recent date, is spoken of as existing already long before Udayana who is reputed coeval with the Buddha, just as Kubhaka (Raghuv. 6, 24) supposes Pataliputra is existing in the days of Rāghu and Ayā!

2 The name of the country Nepal is found in the Brhatkathā. It occurs in the fifteenth tale of the Vetala Kathis 89, 3 and Brhkm 345, ṣl. 718. As far as I know, the name of Nepal is mentioned the first time in the documents available in the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D. It is not met with in Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa. Cp. S. Lavi, *Le Népal* II, 61—63.

On account of the translated wording because *sampatsa* + *capita* + *ca* can hardly be accounted for the locatives are superfluous and would better be wanting.

I would rather think the 4<sup>th</sup> pāda of the stanza must be read thus *teḥkṛtyānṛpateḥ kṛtāḥ imāḥ saḥ sampatsa eḥ itaḥ ca* „these servants are (like) another wife in both prosperity and adversity”

3 The Bihatkāthā knows still *dināras* as pieces of money. In the tale of Viṣvama the daily salary of that loyal warrior is five hundred *dināras*. In the Kathās this is related both times, for the story is told twice over in t 53 and t 78 (cp 53, 92 with 78 [= Vetāla 1], II). Ksemendia, in his set of Vetālastories, instead of *dināraṣaṭapañcakam* expresses the amount of his wages in rupes *sada pañca pradīyantaṃ rājāśānām ṣaṭām me* (p 310, ḥl 279), his parallel of the Viṣvama tale as narrated in Kathās t 53 being exceedingly short (vide p 325), the salary is not even mentioned there. It is plain that Somadeva's *dināras*, not Ksemendia's *rupakas*, represent the coinage as given in the original Bihatkāthā. In the eleventh century there was nothing that might induce an author to replace *rupala* by *dinara*, the name of an obsolete coin, but there must have been a strong bias to put *rupaka*, the name of a coin in ordinary use, instead of the antiquated *dināra*.<sup>1)</sup> The coin named *dināra* is mentioned in inscriptions of the 5<sup>th</sup> century and even later, see *Journ. of the Roy. Asi. Soc.* 1906, p 691.

4 In Kathās 37, 36 foll. the name of the Tūrks occurs. It is not absolutely certain that Somadeva found that name in his original, for Ksemendia in the parallel place (Bilhm p 182) is silent about them. With him, it is Turuskas and Chinās who overpowered and captured Nṛṣavādatta and his comrades, not Turiks, as with Somadeva. The latter does not name at all the Chinās, he names one Turuska, viz. the king Muṣavāna, to whose presence the captives are brought. I hold it for probable that Somadeva is here as usual nearer to the original. Now, it should be kept in mind that the Turks, who are doubtless meant with the name of Turuskas, appear for the first time in history in the sixth century. NOBBIK, in his *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari* p 53 note remarks that „it was not before the time of the Sasanide Chosro I that the Turks became dangerous neighbours of the Persians. It is, however, possible, not to say likely, that they occupied already in the fourth and fifth centuries regions conterminous with the eastern and northern frontier of the Persian monarchy. In that case there would be nothing strange in the fact that an Indian work of the 5<sup>th</sup> century should relate of an Indian merchant, taking his way from Puṣkaraṇatī to the North, who having reached a country inhabited by

<sup>1)</sup> A similar case of *dināra* found in the older recension but ousted and replaced by another word in the younger one is met with in the story of Somadeva in Pañcamaṭṭha. Instead of the *dināra* he earns in the *Tantrāṭhāṭṭhika* (ed. H. J. S., p 61, 12) he receives *savarṇaṣaṭapañcakam* in the younger edition edited by B. H. J. S., p 61, 12.

Tājiks, was made a slave by them and sold to some Turuṣka or some king of Turuṣkas. Again mention is made of the Turuṣkas in the relation of the *digvijaya* of Udayarāja by Somadeva (t. 19), he defeats the cavalry of the Turuṣkas (cl. 109), kills the king of the Pārasikas (cl. 110) and puts to flight the Hunas (cl. 111) — the corresponding passage of Ksemendra (p. 93 f.) is so much shortened that it does not contain anything to be compared. And if we take into account also that in the first book of the Rājataranginī the kings Kaṁska, Huvīska and Viśuṣka (Viśmudeva) are named Turuṣkas, and that this testimony, be it ever so weak, must rest upon some old tradition, there seems to be nothing inconsistent in the fact that in a literary work composed on the eve of the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. the Turks are mentioned as a people established north from Jambudvīpa.

To summarize the inference to be drawn from the foregoing data and indirect indications, there can be no more question of the first or second century as the time of composition of the Pañcāī Brhāt-kathā, as was proposed by Bābley and Vincent A. Smith, and even Levi's option in 1891 for the 3<sup>d</sup> century would make the work somewhat older than it really is. I think Albrecht Weher's opinion uttered rather hesitatingly was nearer to the truth. Yet the work will be older than the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Its composition may be put about one century before, but I dare not go back beyond the year 100.

A strong objection against this conclusion would arise, if de Hertel were right asserting that the Brhāt-kathā, which was Sanskritized by the two Kashmiri poets was not the old and famous work of that name, but a younger compilation enlarged with interpolations of a great extent.<sup>4)</sup> In his opinion such groups of coherent tales, which by themselves represent separate books, as the Panerantaria tales and the Vetulapancuvṁśatī, did not belong to the original work. If this might prove to be true, then the prototype of the poems of Somadeva and Ksemendra would cease to be a creditable source of information and a starting-point for research with respect to the "genuine" Pañcāī Brhāt-kathā known to Subandhu and Bṛhaspati. In each given case the exception of the passage in question belonging to the interpolated portions could be made, by what test should we discern the different elements of the younger compilation?

But the danger is as yet not so imminent. Hertel means we

<sup>4)</sup> In the passage of his preface quoted *supra* p. 41 below.

have to look for the old Gṇadhya's own composition in the third (Sanskrit) redaction discovered by Haria Prasad of which we have spoken *supra*, p. 41. When he expressed this view he had not read even a single letter of the text he claims to stand nearest to the original Bihatkathā for at the time he published it he was not aware nor could he of M. Lacôte's article in the *Journal Asiatique*. He had no other materials at his disposal than the colophons communicated by Haria Prasad M. Lacôte who has the manuscripts at hand and is preparing an edition is more cautious and circumspect in his judgment. He presumes indeed, that tantôt qu'on pent fonder un jugement d'ensemble sur un court fragment, it has the appearance of native colour and genuineness which might induce the reader to think it nearer to the original Gṇadhya than the poem of Somadeva. Yet M. Lacôte is discreet. Est-il un portrait plus fidèle de la Bihatkathā de Gṇadhya que le Kathasarisagara et la Bihatkathamugdhā? Je m'expliquerai ultérieurement sur cette question. Mais il est dès maintenant certain qu'il devient une pièce essentielle dans le procès.

While waiting for the dissertation on this question by M. Lacôte on the ground of the new document at his disposal I think I am justified to uphold the results of my examination of it by the light of the old documents. I draw the attention to the following points.

1. Since the genuine Bihatkathā was composed in Pāṇini the new redaction the *Bihatkathāyam* (or *Ṣiṭṭiṭṭi*?) *śloka-saṃgraha* cannot be but a modified representation of it. Is it a faithful translation or an imitation? The title itself speaks against its being a faithful translation. A *śloka-saṃgraha* does certainly not mean the original work but may denote its complete contents in a compendious form. What it exactly means will perhaps appear when the whole work as far as extant will be published.

2. As we have notified above (*supra*, p. 12) the first story of the *Śloka-saṃgraha* presupposes an account of the precedent events different from the other Bihatkathā. When Udayana abdicated to become an ascetic (Kathā 111-59 foll.) in both Kathā and Bihām it is not Gopālaka but his brother Pālaka who is installed king at Kaṇṇambi though the kingdom had been offered to him by Udayana, he declined it and left the sovereign power for the ascetic life in the forest. So Pālaka has two kingdoms under his sceptre for after the death of his father Candamāliśara he had succeeded to him at Ujyāna (Kathā 111-61-112-13). But in the *Śloka-saṃgraha* Gopālaka reigns at Ujyāna and when being king he grows disgusted with the possession of royal power so that he



abdicates and gives over his kingdom to his brother Palaka. It is difficult to ascribe these contrivances comes of events to one and the same Brhatkatha. If they belong to different redactions, which of the two was the genuine one? It is impossible to decide this a priori. I think.

3 I doubt whether the fragment begins with the first sarga of the whole work. It is more probable I suppose that it is the beginning of a new section. It is not in the habit of the authors of Indian literary compositions, and certainly not of huge poesis to take up their audience or readers directly *à medias res* without any preamble, as is the fact with the first sarga, published by M. Lacôte. The whole purport of its narrative makes the strong impression that it belongs to a new section of the work, but is not the commencement of the whole. The *kathamukham* in the colophon of the third sarga may denote the outset of the narration of the life and adventures of Narayanaadatta told by him self, perhaps to Gopalaka, at a time when he was already consecrated *cakravartin* of the Vidyadharis.

4 M. Lacôte reckons the relation of the life of Gurudhva and the Lumbakas II and III of our Brhatkatha in 18 Lumbakas among the hors d'oeuvre (Journ. As. 11 p. 32). Would he think so if he were not prejudiced by the thought that the MSS of Çloka-samgraha at his disposal contain a fragment of a work which did not comprise the story of Gurudhva and the Udayanarita? The Udayanarita, from the point of view of Indian composition must be considered as essential a part of a Narayanaadattacarita, as for instance the story of Pundit in a narration of the Pandavas or the burning of Kuru in the Kuruvaṃbhava. What prevents its belonging to the much greater portion of the Çloka-samgraha which is not extant? The same applies to the Kathapatha. The original Brhatkatha, methinks must have related in its opening the marvellous process, which accounts for the promulgation among mankind of the divine tale the author of which is God Civa himself. This account is indispensable and conformable to Indian methods of introducing such large collections as the Brhatkatha.

5 Even if we take it for granted that the Çloka-samgraha represents a recension more united and less stuffed with inserted tales derived from heterogeneous sources than the Brhatkatha in eighteen Lumbakas this fact in it self does not necessarily imply its being the older recension. It is something very common in Indian literature to find side by side longer and shorter expiations of the like contents. Many legends and stories in the Mahabharata occur

more than once, sometimes told *saṃāsena*, sometimes *vistareṇa*. Of the *Pratyūparamitā*, the most holy book of the Mahāyānists there exist longer and shorter reductions, all of them canonical: one in 100 000, one in 25 000, one in 18 000, one in 10 000, one in 5000 lines. Is the greatest one also the youngest in time, or are the smaller ones abridgments and extracts of the large *Ātmasahasrapratyūparamitā*? BERNOUT, *Introduction* p. 164 pronounces a *non liquet*. The Kamasūtra of Vātsyāyana pretends to be an extract of Bāhuvya's composition, which is in epitome of a larger work composed by Citaketu, which itself again was the abridgment of the original Kūmasūtra in 1000 adhyāyas revealed by Citra's bull Nandin! For this reason, even if the existence of two Pañcaviṃśatīkathās were to be proved satisfactorily, one larger and one smaller, this fact would not prejudicate the answer to be given at the question about the time relation between them.

6. The story of the Brhatkathā, to which Subandhu (p. 110 of Hall's ed.) alludes, is a tale inserted into the story of Visamaçila which makes up lambaka XVIII of Kātikā. This king and his adventures have nothing at all to do with Nāgavāṃśadatta: safe that N. listens to the narration by Kanva. This story if any would be one of the 'hors d'œuvre' interpolated into the genuine Brhatkathā if interpolation had happened! It was nevertheless known to Subandhu in the sixth century A.D. and known as occurring in Gmādhyā's Brhatkathā.

7. The same passage of Subandhu teaches us also something more. The Brhatkathā, to which he refers, was divided into *lambakas* or *lambhas*. The same division must needs have been that of the Pañcaviṃśatī prototype worked upon in the two Kashmiri poets. In the MSS of Bṛhka the books are called *lambaka* or *lambhaka* (see the article of Bühler in the *Ind. Antiqu.* of 1871 and the colophon of book I, p. 33 of the edit.). In Kathās both editors every where agree in naming them *lambaka*. Cp. *supra*, p. 11, n. 1. But the new fragment is not divided into lambh(ka)s, but into surgas.

As to the person of Gmādhyā, the reputed author of the Brhatkathā, the opinions vary. According to some he is a historical person, according to others, his name is likely to be as fictitious as that of the Vedavyāsa. It is impossible to settle the question. The Brhatkathā has this in common with so many old works ascribed to individual authors that the name of the reputed author occurs in the work itself. How can Śīvalakṛma be the real author of Kathāpūṭha, where his own wondrous history is narrated and he

is spoken of in the third person? Let us rather avow that we do not know anything about the reputed authors of the Great Storehouse of Tales and that is something like to nothing to combine their authorship with the names — mere names, indeed — of Guṇīdhyā and Satavahna, the intrinsic value of which is = x. The only conclusion permitted to us, and this at least is more than nothing, is this, that a celebrated work, the author or authors of which are half mythical persons, must be ancient. For the rest, in questions like these account must be kept with analogous imputation of the authorship of celebrated and authoritative works on mythical personages. I refer to the statement of JORIN in the *Journal of the Roy Asiatic Society* 1907, p. 174, about medical tradition, where he says „Since it was a generally prevailing practice with writers of medical textbooks to give out their compositions as an abridgment of some early work written by a divinely inspired sage ”

---

## SECTION II

### THE TEXT OF THE KATHASARITSĀGARA

#### CHAPTER I

##### THE TWO EDITIONS

##### § 1

As has been stated above (*supra*, p. 7), the Kathāsaritsāgara has been edited twice, by Brockhaus and by Durgaprasāda (and his son Kāśhinātha Pindhuang Parib). The former's edition is based on six MSS for his first volume and on an equal number for his second and third volumes. Yet these are not quite the same. Four of those which served him for his publication of lumb I—V were left aside, when he was preparing the edition of the rest: it necessarily results from a comparison of the two prefaces of 1839 and 1861. It is plain that he could no longer avail himself of M = m 3950 of the *Catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the library of the India Office* for it stops after lumb V, but it is not clear what prevented him from making use, as he did before, of A = nr 3948—50, B = either m 3951—53 or 3956—58, C = m 3954 and 55. Of the other two, one was employed accordingly for the whole work. D, a copy taken from a Calcutta MS, the original of which belongs to the Sanskrit college: this copy is now in the Royal Library at Berlin<sup>1)</sup> as to the other W a copy from a Benares MS, forwarded to him by Wilson. Brockhaus says „aus der hiesigen bibl. cap. 27—61 copirt“, it is now at Oxford in the Bodleian. The four new manuscripts acquired for the constitution of the text of lumb VI—XVIII, H, G, S, and R are now at Berlin in the Royal Library (see Weber's *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit und Prākṛit Handschriften* [der Königl. Bibl. zu Berlin] II, nr 1574—1578). Of them S (nr 1577) is a copy from a

<sup>1)</sup> Brockhaus presented it to the Royal Library of Dresden but afterwards it passed over to Berlin, see Weber's *Verzeichniss* II, nr 1569—1573 with the foot-note 3 on p. 158.

Sigor MS which he had obtained from Itz Edward Hall, its original, a Kashmir MS, the oldest *pustaka* of his whole apparatus „gehörte wohl in den Anfang des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts” (Weber)

The two pundits who brought about the Bombay edition, printed at the Nirṇayaśāgara Press, had besides the edition of Brockhaus two more MSS at their disposition. The former of which they describe thus (p. 2 of their Preface) *lata Kacmuralikṣitam ekam nainam pūyāḥ śuddham asmadyam pustakam*. The other MS did not belong to them, but to the Townhall Royal Library at Bombay, being formerly Dr. Bhan Dīji's, it has been written *samvat 1743 = 1686 A.D.* at Benares and is not so good as the former one — *nāṭicūḍham* — though very neatly kept, *manoharasārupam*. I suppose that it is from the Kashmir MS the editors took a good deal of the excellent corrections by which their publication surpasses the edition of Brockhaus.

Neither edition has the right to be called a critical one. The text is critically edited, but there is no reference whatever made to the various readings of the MSS. Brockhaus, in the Preface on his first volume (p. IX), declares that he did his utmost to make the best of the discrepancies of his MSS. „Nicht überall ist mir dies gelungen, viele Stellen sind nur undeutlich oder ganz unerklärlich geblieben, doch habe ich es als strengen Grundsatz durchgeführt keine Conjecturen in den Text aufzunehmen, sondern nur durch Handschriften autorisirte Lesarten”. In 1839 though he realized, it seems, that a scholarly edition could not do without a mention, however succinct, of the most important various readings especially in such places as remained „undeutlich oder ganz unerklärlich”, yet the addition of them, he says, would have augmented the cost so exceedingly that he was obliged to omit diese Zusätze für so wichtig und nothwendig ich sie auch halte. A similar complaint is made in the Preface on p. IV of the last volume (1866) „Die Varianten aus den Handschriften mitzutheilen, war un möglich, ich hätte dazu den doppelten Raum, den der Text einnimmt, gebraucht

It is a matter of course that the Nirṇayaśāgara Press edition is likewise devoid of even the simplest *apparatus criticus*. Something like this is not in the habit of Hindoo scholars.

If once, in time hereafter, the critical edition suitable for a work of that importance will be called for, many more MSS must be consulted. Aufrecht, in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*, registers them at p. 78 of his I<sup>st</sup> vol., to which he adds others in his Part II and III. I cannot find that Brockhaus availed himself of MS 1574 in Weber's Catalogue.

Tawney, in the notes on his translation, sometimes makes mention of better readings than the text of Brockhaus offered him, which he borrowed from MSS of the Calcutta College. The first time he cites one is Vol I, p 118, with respect to tr 19, 64, where Br <sup>1)</sup> reads *dattasampadaka* and D <sup>1)</sup> has put into the text *'sammadaka*, his MS has *'sambhaka*. At p 155 Tawney doubtless refers to the same MS lent to me by the librarian of the Sanskrit College, <sup>2)</sup> cp his note on p 203, where he calls it an excellent MS. Afterwards he had the opportunity of using also three India Office MSS lent to him by Dr Rost, which I suppose to be those denoted by Brockhaus as A, B and C, readings from them are mentioned in the foot notes from tr 102 till the end of the work, see note on II, 388 etc.

Upon the whole the MSS contain nearly the same text. There are instances of *glokas* found in one MS and wanting in another, but they are few, very few. Tr 23, 4—7 in Br's ed have one line less and one more, than they have in D. D's 23, 4 ab is wanting in Br, and Br's 23, 7 cd is wanting in D. — Between Br 24 116 and 117 D interposes one *loka*; this *loka* (D 21, 117) added improves the narrative style. — Likewise at t 26, 134, D has two *glokas* more and in a place where they are indispensable. This is even transparent in T's <sup>1)</sup> translation (I, 126). There upon the Brahmin set out with the merchant's agents to go to that island of Utsthala and by chance the sons of the king of fishermen saw him there. It is told here that Çaktileva set out to Utsthala but it is not told that he arrived but his departure is closely connected with his meeting in that island with the sons of Sityavata. In D the passage runs thus:— I have bracketed that which is wanting in Br.

*ity uktaḥ tena rājan sa tās tad-yavahuribhiḥ  
 rukam tad Utthāladīpam (Çaktileva yayan talaḥ ||  
 yaḥ sa bandhū mahatma me Visnudatto tra tisthāt  
 pragat tasyau nikatam eastarī iccham tanmatham ||  
 itī samprapya ca dīpam tatkalan ca vicintya sah  
 ūpanmadhyamurgena) gantum pravarata diyaḥ ||*

In 'T' after 'Utsthala' there must, therefore be inserted this, with the intention to stay there with his relative (his uncle) Visnudatta, the reverend inmate of the monastery of that island,

<sup>1)</sup> From henceforward the sign Br denotes Brockhaus and his edition D that of Durvasara. T Tawney's translation t = taran a.

as before. So Cakṭideva reached the island and forthwith began to take his way through the bazar. Then by chance etc.

D in a note on p. 311 of his second edition notifies that the line, corresponding to t. 60-93 of Blochhaus, is wanting in one of his MSS. Considering it an interpolation, he has not put it into the text. I think he is right doing so. In this way the necessity of supposing a hiatus of the former part of cl. 96 disappears. Br. 95cd and 96cd belong together; nothing is wanting between those lines, as B. erroneously believed. In D they are connected, and I II. 32 connected them likewise.

In the vetula nr. 7 t. 81-15 D in a note gives  $1\frac{1}{2}$  additional śloka which he has not put into the text. Those lines are found in one MS and are not mentioned by B.

One śloka t. 103-159 of D is wanting in B. Its addition greatly improves the style. The abrupt transition from the turgid description of the ocean-like host of Migmaditṭa and his father-in-law mṃḡl. 157 and 158 to the very plain matter of fact content of Br. 159 disappears in this way. D has put this śloka into the text; it fills up a gap indeed. — Likewise D has two lines more than are found in B. s. ed. in t. 108 viz. between Br. śl. 151ab and cd. This additional śloka depicts the beauty and loveliness of the maiden Vāṇavegarā. They are quite appropriate to the situation and I hold them for genuine.

After t. 123-260 there is a gap of sundry ślokas which Br. did not realize. It is closed by D's text. We detect the gap by putting together the parallel places in Katha and Bṛhmi. Kusumavudha pupil of a learned brāhmana had fallen in love with the daughter of this teacher. She answered his love but having been promised to another suitor, told him to come here to be carried off. A servant of his whom he had ordered to take her with a male treacherously desiring to keep her for himself conducted her to some distant place, not to his master, then he told her he was going to marry her himself. On beholding herself in his power the girl cunningly feigns to a queen to that sudden change of husband but she says: you must marry me duly and in good order go and fetch the requisite for the nuptial ceremony. Meanwhile he set out to the next town to buy the necessary things. She fled with the male to the dwelling of a goldsmith who concealed her. In Br.'s Katha the feigned ascent of the maiden is only indicated by the 1st śloka: *et caustit s'brauit pr. j. i. ta. i. i. ne sutara pryal* (śl. 260cd) the next line relates in going to the town to make purchase. D inserts here between both one

çloka, the former part of which is *ham evaiva na kim sadyah  
partineyo sy aho mama* the latter part is lost. It is, however,  
obvious that there is lost more. Cp this parallel in Bihkm (p 401,  
çl 35 foll.)

\**pracchudya vaha ko doṣas tam mamabhyadhikah priyah ||  
kim lucitavudhanena trayodasam alam bhaḥ*

*ānayoṣṣarasamagrim tam utriṅgaliyalam* <sup>1)</sup> || (36)

*iti çutia gate lasmims tatāt kamalalocana*

*inena trasat śadhyā mulukamamiranam* || (37)

If we consider that Ksemendī has much shortened here we must conclude to the loss of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or  $2\frac{1}{2}$  çlokas at least which contained her conditions and the suggestion to buy the marriage implements.

The line t 124, 111 cd B<sub>1</sub> is not found in D. It is in fact a dittography of çl 109 cd. çl 112 B<sub>1</sub> is in D the second part of 111 and B<sub>1</sub> s erroneous signs of quotation must disappear.

For the rest the differences of reading are not great and more between limits sufficiently narrow as to make it plain that there can hardly be question of more than one redaction. Instances of variances bearing to whole çlokas are none except t 88 36 where the same fact is said with quite different words in B<sub>1</sub> and in D. Other instances of minor importance are 15 189 44 66 59 82 (D's reading is here much better) 94 51 (here the Calcutta MS considerably differs from both B<sub>1</sub> and D) and 116 49. The last passage deserves a more accurate exposition.

Padmīvatī learns from her attendance that the young man in her presence who has rescued her from the two princesses is the very prince destined by her father to be her husband. She is extremely rejoiced by that news and likewise the young man is delighted. The çloka descriptive of their mutual feeling is in B<sub>1</sub> as follows

*tato nyonya parijñāna lāṣa pūrṇe nyatmani*

*, yuktaṁ yad adya ita ayatā ite kamariṣṭau ubhau ||*

in 1 s translation (II, 520) Then the princess and her lover had their hearts filled with joy at discovering one another, and they both thought, „it is well that we came here today. Here the absence

) The aksara lost and marked as such in the printed text may be  $\gamma$ . I conjecture  
t  $\text{kr} < \gamma > \eta$  lig lam

Ve band ko Akul v W eos h Mā Leterk S F Dū Vmā S\*



of the word meaning *thought* in the original is somewhat strange, though not impossible. But D has a quite different reading, doubtless the right one

*yullam tad yan na matah sma tau kumaravay ubhan*  
it was a matter of course that they could not contain themselves (for joy). Cp 22, 131 *na mati sma mada hīacit*. The comparative-ness of the idiom *na mati* with that meaning may be a factor in the origin of the various reading.

Another instance of a genuine reading ousted by its difficulty is t 18, 189. The gallant Vidusikī, having rescued the princess and placed her into her private apartments, is taking his leave, but she does not allow it. 'Stay with me' she says, 'when you are gone this breath of mine will leave my body overcome with fear.' Whereupon he resolves to remain, reflecting thus [T I, 134]. If I go, and leave this maiden she may possibly die of fear. The original line in question translated thus by T from Br's text is *tyaktvemaṃ yad gacchami muncet prāṇaṃ bhayaḍ iyaṃ*. D has a lectio difficilior, viz *yad astu me na gacchami* etc. = 'happen what may I remain she might possibly die of fear'. The idiom *yad astu* = 'come what will' fr *adieu ce que pourra* has given way in most MSS. it seems to a somewhat synonymous turn of phrase more common but less forcible. In the other instances, where it occurs it has however kept its place 27, 86 54, 123 71 133 153 73 156 81, 21 101, 904 113 40 *tad bhavati* with the same meaning is met with 33, 45 and 57 161 likewise *yad vidhattur vidhu mama* 57, 99 and *yattu eastu* 101 135. I have enumerated these instances, because they represent also a syntactical peculiarity not registered elsewhere. It is of course in elliptical turn *yad astu (bhavati)* is a brachy-logical form of *yad astu astu yad bhavatu bhavatu*. A slight variation of it is exhibited 119 86 B. *yad bhavati* = 'quod futurum est sc. fut. but D instead of *yad bhavati* has *yad bhavati* evidently a false reading.

A few times the variances concern some rare or provincial word for which in part of the mss a more common word has been substituted. Is *mecaka* 124 197 D (*gyāṃla* B.) *teraki* 121 237 D, cp 1 II 54 n 1 (*Japantah* B.) likewise 1, 25 D.

*prigaypranajahetaki yato ummatunanal*

B. has *prigayranajalecattam*, the vitiated reading.

Finally I remind of the various reading in the first stanza of the *pravastī* at the end of the work and edited in D. Br. did not

take it up in his edition I cannot understand for what reason for he found it in his MSS Wrrrr in his Catalogue of MSS vol II (1886) p 161 repuned the omission of the editor of Kathis publishing the *pragasti* in extenso with the discrepancies of the Berlin MSS So we know that ling Singumruja of Kashmir the forefather of king Harsa in whose reign Somadeva composed his poem is connected in some MSS with Sitavahana in others it seems not so The MSS (marked by Br) H and S begin the *pragasti* thus *cusitar ilanakul ibidly nyatal Sangra maraja iti*, and this is also the reading adopted by D But in the MS W the first pada is *sa igramlabdharavrubhijaparvatanal* what is materially different It looks as if the reputed descent from the legendary king, Sita (or Sita) vahana was disbelieved by some who changed the words of Somadeva accordingly

## 62

While perusing *It* I was stricken by the comparatively great number of verses in this edition that sm <sup>g</sup> must the laws of the metre *All of them with a few exceptions are edited in D without fault* In 191 cases his verses are too short in 60 they are too long Here is the list of them

too short    2 39 — 3 38 48 — 7 111 (vasantatilaka) —  
 10 15 — 12 21 151 — 13 112 — 14 11  
 71 — 18 200 320 323 — 20 173 183 221 —  
 22 195 — 24 13 64 — 25 60 112 110 —  
 26 201 229 — 27 71 — 28 60 — 30 121  
 31 62 — 33 26 — 36 1 — 37 331 — 38  
 10 29 175 — 40 25 — 42 90 191 — 43  
 133 — 44 165 — 45 115 — 46 16 14 112  
 117 — 47 51 115 — 48 14 63 — 49 35  
 231 [= 229 D] — 50 35 1) 130 1) 172 1) 206 1)  
 [va antatilikā] — 51 60 130 151 — 52 213 314  
 — 53 93 — 54 11 13 61 105 210 — 55 222 —  
 56 31 181 313 1) 335 1) 338 1) 319 1) — 57 70  
 135 151 — 58 133 — 59 61 113 129 — 60  
 71 217 1) 232 1) 244 1) — 61 256 — 62 128  
 216 — 63 22 19 111 — 64 101 225 241 —  
 66 21 13 51 — 69 27 60 116 132 170 —

3) In D the cap of the clock must be lined with ne

70 36 16 — 71 19 101 158 218 287 — 72,  
 65 75 173 301 350 392 — 73, 8 178 291  
 403 438 — 74 222 227 — 75, 123 — 77, 32  
 56 — 80, 6 (see I's note at II, 261) 10 — 81,  
 21 45 — 82, 15 — 86, 57 85 122 128 — 90,  
 13 — 92, 2 22 35 — 93, 94 — 94, 132 —  
 95, 16 51 52 66 91 — 97, 27 — 101, 32 —  
 102, 18 — 103, 172 — 104, 111 [= 110 D] —  
 105, 29 47 53 63 — 106 45 — 107 25 118  
 123 — 108 180 [= 181 D] 109, 49 60 94 142 —  
 110 22 <sup>1)</sup> 63 89 123 — 111, 60, — 112, 165 —  
 113, 18 82 — 114, 67 83 104 — 115, 3 82  
 146 — 117, 166 — 118, 26 179 — 119, 5 67  
 108 115 — 121 24 41 118 — 123, 67 200  
 221 247 322 — 124 105 214 [= 213 D]

too long 1 36 57 — 6, 56 <sup>2)</sup> — 10, 92 — 11 61 — 17,  
 80 — 18, 153 316 — 21, 112 116 — 25, 160 —  
 26 12 — 30, 45 — 31, 95 — 35, 27 — 30,  
 105 236 — 40 22 — 43 252 (गुणः) 256 (चंद्रिका)  
 271 (नृपति) — 44 73 — 45, 142 — 49, 4 21 —  
 50, 85 [= 87 D] — 52 111 331 — 55 55 <sup>2)</sup> 232 —  
 60 32 — 64, 132 — 65 157 167 251 — 66  
 35 — 71, 221 — 72 305 356 — 74, 133 —  
 77 53 — 86 113 — 92, 57 81 — 96, 34 —  
 98, 14 — 101, 127 208 — 104, 153 [= 152 D] —  
 110 73 — 111 99 — 115 26 — 116 55 —  
 117 40 95 — 118 108 123 — 119, 28 — 120,  
 66 — 123 110

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped as 49, 231 73 138 80 6 108, 180 114 83 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in Br, by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another e.g. 52, 314 *pūspit* before *pūspam* 39 10 *lāta* after *ekatra*. A remarkable case of *pramada* is 59, 129 a. Br reads that line

*dr̥ṣṭva Somaṣprabhaṁ „ko 'yam? ity ajrecl'yata*

<sup>1)</sup> In D this *pit* is an error of print for *ner* *er* *en*

<sup>2)</sup> Br has *re* *re* *re* for *re* *re* *re*, and *re* *re* *re* instead of *re* *re* *re*

From D it appears that the genuine text is

*distva Somaprabham lo 'yam ite svanam apicchyata*

Consequently Br not only dropped the word *svanam* but applied the sandhi to *ite* + *apicchyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre — At 25 60 Sitywita being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers

*Im tu distva bahudvipadīcītanapī na su mayā  
nagari tadabhipreṭa dīpīteṣu śrūta pūnah ||*

though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for, yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands This is the right text of D. But whether owing to bad readings of his ms. or a mistake of his own represents it as follows *Im tu distā bahudvipa distī adya* [his peculiar analysis of *distadya*] *na su mayā* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with *diśvan* according to Pīṇi 3 2 94 — In the same t. 25 at q. 112 Br edits with the omission of one syllable *adhradyudapitadarnam*, where he had to put *anabhrā*°, as of course D has by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression for Somadeva does not say as P translates according to Br's text an attack of the fire of grief terrible like the falling of lightning from a cloud but — from a cloudless sky a frequent image in poetry

In 69 138 where Br edited the last pāda *paṣṣaṣṭi t m eia unmanah* his mistake and in consequence of it his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre was caused by a misunderstanding for *unmanah* D has *tanmanah* and now all is right Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense is 21 54 *śaḍagbhoṣaṭa* (D) Br *śaḍ agl*°

The misreading coincides here with violation of the metre Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times, part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors It may, however be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of deprivation in Br's text

*dy* and *gh* are confounded 57, I see Winkler *Verzenhuss* etc (1886) p. 159 n. 2

*s* and *m* (c. g. 102, 113 *sa samanayal* for *samamunayal*)

*sv* and *lh* 106, 110 (*lheda* for *sveda*)

*i* and *dh* 12, 49 (*dhīṭavan* for *śīṭavan*) 26, 17 (*dhārayam* for *śārayam*) 49, 2 (*dhya* for *ura*)

70, 36 46. — 71, 19 101 158 218 287 — 72,  
 65 75. 173. 301. 350. 392 — 73, 8 178. 291  
 403 438 — 74, 222. 227. — 75, 123. — 77, 32.  
 56 — 80, 6 (see T's note nt 11, 261) 10 — 81,  
 21 45 — 82, 15. — 86, 57. 85. 122 128 — 90,  
 13 — 92, 2. 22. 38 — 93, 94 — 94, 132 —  
 95, 16. 51. 52 66. 91. — 97, 27 — 101, 32. —  
 102, 48 — 103, 172. — 104, 111 [= 110 D] —  
 105, 29. 47 53 63 — 106, 48 — 107, 25 118.  
 123 — 108, 180 [= 181 D] 109, 49. 60 94. 142. —  
 110, 22 <sup>1)</sup> 63 89. 123 — 111, 60, — 112, 163 —  
 113, 48 82 — 114, 67. 83 104 — 115, 3 82  
 146 — 117, 166 <sup>1)</sup> — 118, 20 179 — 119, 5 67.  
 105 115 — 121, 24 44 118 — 123, 67. 200.  
 221 247 322 — 124, 105 214 [= 213 D]  
 too long 1, 36 57 — 6, 56 <sup>2)</sup> — 10, 92 — 11, 64 — 17,  
 80 — 18, 153 316 — 21, 112. 116 — 25, 100. —  
 26, 12 — 30, 48 — 34, 95 — 36, 27 — 39,  
 105 236 — 40, 22 — 43, 252 (ñāñ) 256 (cārdūlav.)  
 274 (upigiti) — 44, 73 — 45, 142 — 49, 4 21 —  
 50, 85 [= 87 D] — 52, 111 331 — 55, 55 <sup>2)</sup> 232. —  
 60, 32 — 64, 132 — 65, 157 167 251 — 66,  
 35 — 71, 221 — 72, 305 356 — 74, 153 —  
 77, 53 — 86, 143 — 92, 57 81 — 96, 34 —  
 98, 14 — 101, 127 208 — 104, 153 [= 152 D] —  
 110, 73 — 114, 99 — 115, 26 — 116, 55 —  
 117, 40 95 — 118, 108 123 — 119, 28 — 120,  
 66 — 123, 110

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses, which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped, as 49, 231 73, 138 80, 6 108, 180 114, 83 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in mss. by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another, e.g. 52, 314 *pūṣpa* before *pūṣpa*, 39, 10 *tatva* after *ekatva*. A remarkable case of *pramāda* is 59, 129 a. B<sub>1</sub> reads that line

*distā Somaprabhām, „ko 'yam?' ity apicchyata*

<sup>1)</sup> In D *manṣṭhya* is an error of print for *manṣṭya*

<sup>2)</sup> Tr has *śuāṣam* for *stāṣam*, and *prithuyāni* instead of *prithujāni*

From D it appears that the genuine text is

*distva Somaprabham lo 'yam ite svairam apricchyata*

Consequently B<sub>1</sub> not only dropped the word *svairam* but applied the sandhi to *ite* + *apricchyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre — At 25, 60 Sitywata being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers

*kim tu distva bahudvipadī rānapi na sa mayā  
nagari tadabhipreta dīpintere śrīta punah ||*

though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands' This is the right text of D B<sub>1</sub> whether owing to bad readings of his ms or a mistake of his own represents it as follows *kim tu distva bahudvipa drsta 'adya* [his peculiar analysis of *drstadya*] *na sa mayā* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable, but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with *°dīpī* according to Pāṇini 3, 2, 91 — In the same l 25 at §1 112 B<sub>1</sub> edits with the omission of one syllable *abhravidyudupstadatunam* where he had to put *anabhrā°*, as of course D has, by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression, for Somadeva does not say as I translate according to B<sub>1</sub>'s text in attack of the fire of grief trouble like the falling of lightning from a cloud but — from a cloudless sky — a frequent image in poetry

In 69 138 where B<sub>1</sub> edited the last padī *paṇḍitaś ca tva  
tumanā* his mistake and in consequence of it his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre was caused by a misunderstanding for *tumanā* D has *tanmanā* and now all is right Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense is 21 51 *śaṅkhaśyālo* (D), B<sub>1</sub> *śaṅkha°*

The misunderstanding coincides here with violation of the metre Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors It may however, be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of depravation in B<sub>1</sub>'s text

*dy* and *gh* are confounded 57, 1 see Wimmer *Leuzenluis* etc (1886) p 159 n 2

*s* and *m* (c g 102, 113 *sa samanaya* for *samamunaya*)

*ś* and *kh* 106, 110 (*kheda* for *śveda*)

*v* and *dh* 12, 19 (*dhītan* for *śītan*) 26, 17 (*dhanyam* for *śanyam*), 19, 2 (*dhūa* for *śūa*)

70, 36 46 — 71, 19 101 158 218 287 — 72,  
 65 75 173 301 350 392 — 73, 8 178 291  
 403 438 — 74, 22<sup>a</sup> 227 — 75, 123 — 77, 32  
 56 — 80, 6 (see T's note at II, 261) 10 — 81,  
 21 48 — 82, 15 — 86, 57 85 122 128 — 90,  
 13 — 92, 2 22 39 — 93, 94 — 94, 132 —  
 95, 16 51 52 66 91 — 97, 27 — 101, 32. —  
 102, 48 — 103, 172 — 104, 111 [= 110 D] —  
 105, 29 47 53 63 — 106, 48 — 107, 25 118  
 123 — 108, 180 [= 181 D] 109, 49 60 94 142 —  
 110, 22 <sup>1)</sup> 63 89 123 — 111, 60, — 112, 165 —  
 113, 48 82 — 114, 67 83 104 — 115, 3 82  
 146 — 117, 166 — 118, 26 179 — 119, 5 67  
 108 115 — 121, 24 44 118 — 123, 67 200  
 221 247 322 — 124, 105 214 [= 213 D]  
 too long 1, 36 57 — 6, 56 <sup>2)</sup> — 10, 92 — 11, 64 — 17,  
 80 — 18, 153 316 — 21, 112 116 — 25, 160 —  
 26, 12 — 30, 48 — 34, 95 — 38, 27 — 39,  
 105 236 — 40, 22 — 43, 252 (āra ā) 256 (ṣardulav)  
 271 (upagiti) — 44, 73 — 45, 142 — 49, 4 21 —  
 50, 88 [= 87 D] — 52, 111 331 — 55, 55 <sup>3)</sup> 232 —  
 60, 32 — 64, 132 — 65, 157 167 254 — 66,  
 35 — 71, 221 — 72, 305 356 — 74, 153 —  
 77, 53 — 86 143 — 92, 57 81 — 96, 34 —  
 98, 44 — 101, 127 208 — 104, 153 [= 152 D] —  
 110, 73 — 111, 99 — 115, 26 — 116, 55 —  
 117, 40 95 — 118 108 123 — 119, 28 — 120,  
 66 — 123, 110

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses, which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped, as 19, 231 73, 138 80, 6 108, 180 114 83 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in me, by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another, e.g. 52, 314 *jayi* before *jayam*, 39, 10 *tatra* after *ekatra*. A remarkable case of *pranāda* is 59, 129 a. Br reads that line

*desteṭ Somaprabhāṭi „ko 'yam?" ity ajreechyaṭa*

<sup>1)</sup> In D *n excepta* is an error of print for *n etya*.

<sup>2)</sup> It has *āra ā* for *āra ā*, and *ṣardulav* instead of *pratyāṇ*.

From D it appears that the genuine text is

*distva Somaprabham lo 'yam ita svairam apcechyata*

Consequently Br not only dropped the word *svairam* but applied the sandhi to *ita* + *apcechyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre — At 25 60 Satyamita being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers

*Im tu distva bahudvipaḍiśanapī na sī mayā  
nagari tadabhipeta dīpanteru śrūta punah ||*

though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for, yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands. This is the right text of D. But whether owing to bad readings of his mss. or a mistake of his own represents it as follows: *Im tu distva bahudvipa distva 'adja* [his peculiar analysis of *distadya*] *na sī mayā* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable, but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with *°dīpan* according to Pāṇini 3 2 91 — In the same t. 25 it cl. 112 Br edits with the omission of one syllable *abhravidyudopataharṇam* where he had to put *anabhrā*°, as of course D has, by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression for Somadeva does not say as I translate according to Br's text an attack of the fire of great terrible like the falling of lightning from a cloud but — from a cloudless sky' a frequent image in poetry.

In 69 138 where Br edited the list *pāṇi pūya* is *Im eva numanaḥ* his mistake and in consequence of it his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre, was caused by a misreading for *numanaḥ* D has *tanmanah* and now all is right. Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense is 21 34 *adaghoḥyata* (5) Br *tad agl*°.

The misreading coincides here with violation of the metre. Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times, part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor. It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors. It may, however, be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of deprivation in Br's text.

*dy* and *gh* are confounded 57, 1 see WIEBER *Lezen/miss* etc. (1886) p. 159 n. 2

*s* and *m* (c. g. 102, 113 *sa samunayat* for *sarīam mayat*)

*sv* and *kh* 106, 110 (*kheda* for *veda*)

*v* and *dh* 12, 19 (*dhītanam* for *vītanam*), 26, 17 (*dhīrayam* for *vīrayam*), 19, 2 (*dhīra* for *vīra*)



*i* and *n* 45, 232 (*pravitam* is to be corrected into *pravitam*  
D Prahlāda beheld „her dancing” not her „who came forward  
to dance”, as T I, 425 translated, misled by Br) So 15,  
52 (*nyojitah* for *vi*), 59, 16 (*vyadhāt* for *nyadhāt*), 23, 40  
(Br *vidhūm avapasyasi*, it ought to be *vidhūm*, cp 45 *vidhūnam*),  
74, 221 (*nuartita*° for *uarta*°, the same blunder 104, 32  
113, 65 123, 58)

*n* and *i* 119, 200 (Br *na payanti* instead of *tapasyanti* D and T)  
56, 111 (*anāyanti* for *anāyanti*, as Kern corrected already  
in 1868). Sometimes the particle of interrogation *nu* has  
become to *tu*, as 51, 258 (D has here also the corrupt  
reading) 71, 57 78, 107.

*nn* and *ti* B<sub>1</sub> put *tatra* for *tan na* 46, 178 101, 230 106,  
157, and inversely 106, 90 Cp. also 105, 73 A somewhat  
comic result of that interchange is met with 65, 46, where  
Br makes a Bodhisattva gratify living beings and Piśācas by  
„pre-sents of water and jewels” (T II 104), while the poet  
meant *jalan anna* (with water and food) not *jalan ratna*,  
as we read in Br The same mistake impairs 66, 154 Instead  
of *dhanai ratna*, *ca* (Br) D has *dhanai annai*, *ca*, the  
evident meaning of the passage is clear from cl 153 *preṣyam*  
*asa pakiaṇṇāni dhanani ca* An instance of putting *tra*  
into the text instead of *ni* occurs 57, 106

*t* and *bh* *abhi* for *ati* 38 115 inversely t 99, 50 B<sub>1</sub> has  
wrongly *atyaturyat* for *abhyaturyat* (D) At 77, 13 Br mis-read  
*sabhyam* ‘judge, umpire, and put *satyam* into his text, D  
rendered to the verse its true wording *uccayayatha sabhyam*  
*tam rujanatram upayathuh* The inverse error, *sabhy* for *saty*,  
occurs 56, 247 The plain and appropriate expression of this śloka  
*tac chrutvā dīyahaṃsam sa mataḥ satyabhibhūṣanam*  
*mumoca Damayanti tam etam asti iti vadasi* ||

as it is edited in D h, is miserably perplexed in Br, where  
the word *sabhyabhibhūṣanam* deceived Tawney who (I, 560)  
translates „she thought that the celestial swan was a polished  
speaker” instead of — spoke the truth Here Boethlingk  
detected the mistake of Br, see Petr Diet VII, 674 s v  
*sabhya* in true

*r* and *ri* 10, 107 (*trīya* for *trīya*) 26, 269 Br = 271 D  
(*trīu* for *trīu*) Likewise *r* for *ra* 105, 157, see F II, 459 n 3  
Other samples may be 58, 139 *tatah sa samprāpya puṇah*

\*) Where it is gl 216

*svatayam* (B) spoils this line editing *latal samam prapya* etc.) 68 11 *udghātāt*, misread by B as *īdātāt*, see P W K 1) I 234 s. v. *udātā* 88 52 *śucubhād apī karimāṇā* (D) where B has *śaṣubhād* 103 5 where B against the obvious sense put *śaspeṇ* instead of *śasyeṇ* the wrong reading *śama* for *śyām* at 87 30 and 121 136 B [= 135 D] cp. 1's note on II, 619 the confounding of anusvara with *r* and *l* at 19 73 and 25 204 — in the former place D has *malimardabājō*°, in the latter *te* (B *lam*) — 7 84 *śaṃtputya* B seems to represent a misread *śaṃtsūrya* (D) 13, 13 *śaptaka* (B) a misread *mastaka* (D) and 73 7 *Vicitralallam attā tāṇ* (B) a misread *Vicitrakallasaṃyāham* (D)

Mistakes such as putting *ea* for *ea* (13 117 20 102 35 131 120 62) or inversely (111 76) *ei* for *ehā* (123, 171) *eta* for *ela* (20 197) *hita* for *lata* (20 226 75 95) or inversely (81 8) *apel* for *upel* (17 12) or inversely (70 17) *apakṛya* for *ipakṛya* (93 68) *ayam* for *alam* (21 20 21 169) *vismita* for *īsmi* (31 216) *gana* for *guṇa* or inversely (e g 15, 368) and the like may be caused partly by incorrect reading of the MSS partly also by not correcting ordinary clerical errors wherever common sense convinces them. The ingenuous avowal of B in the Preface of the first Volume (p. IX) that he nowhere has put into the text any conjecture not backed by mss. authority practically resulted towards preferring occasional abduction of his intellectual faculties to disregarding a palpable corrupt tradition in the mss. which he happened to have the use of.

The confusion between *b* and *v* and between the different sibilants in his MSS made him now and then take a wrong way. Of the former kind t 123 175 and 191 afford good instances in both places B writes *janyatalakam* which should be written *janyabalakam* as is edited indeed in D = the company of the bridegroom's friends (I II 602). As to the sibilants B sometimes puts *disa* for *duṣa* fisherman (e g 52 337) *reṣa* for *reṣa*. A remarkable mistake is t 20 122 *aṣu ea* (B) for *asta ea* (D) which could be easily made since *sta* and *su* can be very similar in manuscripts another t 101 13 *bisam* spelt *vigam*.

Another source of errors was effected by his singular method of separating the words and word-complexes something very proper to produce errors of any kind. In the 2<sup>d</sup> and 3<sup>d</sup> volumes the

) Henceforward I W denotes the Ietropolitan Det o ars, I W h the Ietr Det an kaiserer Fassung

*u* and *u* 45, 232 (*pravittam* is to be corrected into *pranittam* D Prahlāda beheld „her dancing” not her „who came forward to dance”, as T I, 425 translated, misled by Br) So 15, 82 (*nyojitah* for *u*°), 59, 46 (*nyadhāt* for *nyadhāt*), 23, 40 (Bī *vādhān aṅuṣyaṣi*, it ought to be *midhūn*, cp 45 *midhūnam*), 71, 221 (*unaitita*° for *unaitita*°, the same blunder 101, 32 113, 65 123, 58)

*n* and *t* 119, 200 (Bī *na paṣyanti* instead of *tapasyanti* D and T) 86, 111 (*anūyanti* for *anūyanti*, as Kern corrected already in 1866). Sometimes the particle of interrogation *nu* has become to *te*, as 54, 258 (D has here also the corrupt reading) 71, 57 78, 107

*nn* and *ti* Bī put *tata* for *tan na* 16, 178 101, 230 106, 157, and inversely 106, 90 Cp. also 105, 73 A somewhat curious result of that interchange is met with 65, 46, where Br makes a Bodhisattva gratify living beings and Piṣṭas by „presents of water and jewels” (T II, 104), while the poet meant *jalanir annaṁ* (with water and food) not *jalanir ratnaṁ*, as we read in Br ‘The same mistake impairs 66, 154 Instead of *dhanair ratnaṁ ca* (Bī) D has *dhanair annaṁ ca*, the evident meaning of the passage is clear from cl 153 *preṣayān asa pakṣiṇāṁ dhanair ca* An instance of putting *tā* into the text instead of *n* occurs 57 106

*t* and *dh* *abhi* for *ati* 35, 115 inversely *t* 99, 50 Bī has wrongly *atyātasyat* for *abhyātasyat* (D) At 77, 13 Br misread *sabhyam* ‘judge, umpire, and put *satyam* into his text, D rendered to the verse its true wording *niṣṭayayatha sabhyam tam rajaputram upayathah* ‘The inverse error, *sabhya* for *satya*, occurs 56, 217 ‘The plain and appropriate expression of this śloka *tae chrutā dayakamṣam sa mata satyabhibhasanam mumoca Damayanti tam etam asti iti viduḥ* ||

as it is edited in D<sup>1)</sup>, is miserably perplexed in Br, where the word *sabhyabhibhasanam* deceived Tawney, who (I, 560) translates „she thought that the celestial swan was a polished speaker” instead of ‘— spoke the truth Here Bochtlingk detected the mistake of Br, see Petr Dict VII, 671 s v *sabhya* in true

*r* and *ri* 10, 107 (*traya* for *traya*) 26, 269 Br = 271 D (*trṣu* for *trisu*) likewise *r* for *ra* 105, 157, see T II, 159 n 3 Other samples may be 55, 139 *tatah sa samprāpya punah*

<sup>1)</sup> Where it is cl 16

*śaṭāṅgam* (B<sub>1</sub> spoils this line editing *tatal samam prapya* etc.)  
 68 11 *udghātāt*, misread by B<sub>1</sub> as *udātāt*, see P.W.K. II, 234  
 as *udātāt*, 88, 52 *sacubhūḍ apī karmanāl* (D), while B<sub>1</sub> has  
*śaṭāṅgulūḍ*, 103, 5 while B<sub>1</sub> against the obvious sense put *raspeṣu*  
 instead of *sasyeṣu* the wrong reading *uṣma* for *uṣṇa* at 87, 30  
 and 121 136 B<sub>1</sub> [= 135 D], cp. '1's note on II, 619 the  
 confounding of *musaṇa* with *i* and *e* at 19, 73 and 25 204  
 — in the former place D has *mukhārdabbhaya*°, in the latter *te*  
 (B<sub>1</sub> *lam*) — 7, 84 *saṃutpadya* B<sub>1</sub> seems to represent a misread  
*saṃutsoṇya* (D) 13, 13 *saptaka* (Br) a misread *maṣṭaka* (D) and  
 73, 7 *Pūṭhakattham alha taṇ* (B<sub>1</sub>) a misread *Pūṭhātallasaṃyā*  
*kaṇ* (D)

Mistakes such as putting *eta* for *na* (13, 117, 20 102 55,  
 131 120, 62) or inversely (111, 76) *etam* for *ekam* (123 171)  
*eta* for *eka* (25 197) *kita* for *kata* (20 226 75 95) or in  
 versely (84 8), *apeka* for *upaka* (17 12) or inversely (70 17)  
*apaṭṭiya* for *upakṭiya* (93, 68) *ayam* for *aham* (21 25 21 169)  
*viṣṇuṭa* for *viṣṇuṭa* (34 216) *gana* for *guṇa* or inversely (c g  
 15, 368) and the like may be caused partly by incorrect reading  
 of the MSS, partly also by not correcting ordinary clerical errors  
 wherever common sense convinces them. The ingenious novel of  
 B<sub>1</sub> in the Preface of the first Volume (p. IX) that he nowhere  
 has put into the text any conjecture not backed by mass authority  
 practically resulted towards preferring occasional abduction of his  
 intellectual faculties to disregarding a palpable corrupt tradition in  
 the MSS which he happened to have the use of.

The confusion between *ś* and *v* and between the different sibi-  
 lants in his MSS made him now and then take a wrong way. Of  
 the former kind t 123, 175 and 191 afford good instances.  
 in both places B<sub>1</sub> writes *janyatalakam* which should be written  
*janyabalakam* as is edited indeed in D = 'the company of the  
 bridegroom's friends' (I II 602). As to the sibilants B<sub>1</sub> some-  
 times puts *duṣa* for *duṣa* fisherman (c g 52 337) *teṣa* for *teṣa*  
 A remarkable mistake is t 20 122 *uṣa ca* (B<sub>1</sub>) for *uṣṭa ca* (D)  
 which could be easily made since *śta* and *ṣa* can be very similar  
 in manuscripts another t 101 13 *bisum* spelt *uṣum*.

Another source of errors was effected by his singular method of  
 separating the words and word-complexes, something very proper  
 to produce errors of any kind. In the 2<sup>d</sup> and 3<sup>d</sup> volumes the

\*) Henceforward I W denotes the Leipzig Dictionary P.W.K. the Leipzig Dictionary in  
 kürzerer Fassung

necessity of transcription added to this other fresh opportunities of mistakes. In a very great number of places *a* is printed where *ā* is meant or ought to be meant, or inversely. See e.g. T II, 332 n 1 — appertains to t 93, 73 —, PW V, 1468 s v *tūṇa*, VI, 833 s v *vas* + *a* at the end, t 107, 118 (*hanta* for *hanta*), all cases of *a* erroneously put for *ā* — Examples of the inverse mistake are e.g. 12, 93 *vājāntim* (sq B1) for *vājantim* (T I, 383 understood it rightly), 52, 334 *phalākaka* for *ka* 62, 182 71, 191. 72, 56, 344 103, 61, cp also PW V, 1491 s v *duri*, VII, 414 s v *racurga* (t 89, 57 to be added) and VII, 456, *saṃyatrīkā* Kāth 80, 30 fehlerhaft für *saṃyatrīkā*. Even a few instances occur in the first volume with nāgari types 25, 284 *jāpacānu* for *jāpacānu*, ib 203 and 17, 93 (see PW I, 739 s v *usukhāra*).

Sometimes the aspirate consonant is erroneously put instead of the non aspirate one or inversely 14, 16 (*kh* for *k*) 16, 46 74, 210 101, 186 (*dh* for *d*) 19, 65 (*kh* for *k*) 22, 240 (*d* for *dh*, cp T, I, 185 n, D confirms his emendation) 39, 161 (*ḷ* for *bh*) 46, 199 (*uḡna[h]* for *uḡna[h]*) 90 12 (*adṛcyah* for *adṛcyah*, cp T II, 308 note) 110 14 and 98 (*dh* for *d*). A similar kind of error through transcription is *nd* for *nd* 9, 7 (*danda* instead of *danda*) 9, 9 (*Sandilya* instead of *Ṣandilya*). Once, by a similar inadvertence, writing *l* for *d*, B1 destroys the *pointe* of a saying (t 54, 92).

Another kind of mistakes consists in wrongly dividing the *scriptio continua* of his MSS. At 7, 17 Br edits the second line thus *sa ca 'atāṇa deva lēlasya 'eva mūṇakanyaka*, where he had to divide *sa ca 'atāṇa deva lēlasya 'eva*. At 13, 23 *sahastikapañ camah*, *sa* is erroneously made part of the compound, D severs it from the rest by the inverse mistake of separating *sa*, where it is part of a compound, occurs e.g. 15, 109, in the next cl *lad vlsuham* is printed instead of *ladatsuham*. Similar faults are numerous in B1. T I, 100 note writes "I read with a MS in the Sanskrit College — *bhāyade hū mūrta na sūhase*", Br had before him the same reading but misunderstood his text, dividing it as follows *bhāya-dehāmūrta na sūhase* (t 43, 202), which is devoid of sense, of a similar nature are T's notes on 1, 442 (t 16, 172), II 344 (t 95, 35 Br), 398 note 4 (t 103, 41), 444 note 1 (t 107, 62) and on p 106 and 612, T (II, 105) tacitly corrects the

<sup>1)</sup> Cp also 89, 31 17, 70. The alj *sibca* 'a ac' is 70, 15 and 71, 20 erroneously into *sa brahmacā* 11.

nonsensical reading of 71<sup>1</sup> 27 B<sub>1</sub>, and elsewhere KERN corrected some of these mistakes in his *Remarks* in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* of 1868, p. 168 foll. In some cases the wrong analysis would have been concealed, if the editor had used nūgarī types and in the usual way. Of the kind is t 45, 399 *tattvam* wrongly for *tat tām* t 50 121 ..

*Divyā 'alam pṛeṣitā tām pratyāśiṣṭam ca layā tara*  
where is the line must be read *°pṛeṣitā tām pratyāśiṣṭam ca* etc  
t 54, 149

*apagyan sa śubham lagnam pagyan na śalūyam sah*,  
where the obvious meaning of the context compels to divide *pagyan* *aśalūyam*, cp PW VII, 13 s v *śalūna* with a°, t 86, 59 *yuac* *śauram* are two words, not one compound. We have here an instance of the turn *na parāṁ yuac* = not only but also' cp my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 180 R 1<sup>1</sup>). Sometimes B<sub>1</sub> was wrong in his distribution of two words amalgamated by eventual contraction of final and initial vowel into *u* (*yu ca ra*) At 91, 97 it is said of a boy seven years old that even at this age he always took pleasure in benefiting his fellow men in good Sanskrit this must be expressed *sadu parahite ratah*, B<sub>1</sub>'s analysis *sadu aparahite ratah* is against the idiom. Other instances are 16, 40 (see I s note at I 111) 25 200 (*agantam* for *yuntam*) 73 77 (see I s note 2 at II 195). A similar fault is committed 101 91 — to read *stlane lala* B<sub>1</sub>'s *stlane* is impossible since this should be connected with the preceding words. *lala* would become the first word of the sentence.

In sundry cases B<sub>1</sub> erroneous distinction of the *scriptio continua* deceived himself. I adduce some instances.

T 21, 24 King Vidyakumara tells his queen that he is troubled with anxiety about a suitable marriage for their daughter Kumārekha. The poet makes him use this elegant turn of phrase that she is growing up together with his care thereabout *ardhaman saha ratasammodahacintaya* / eva Kanakarekha me Irdayaṁ deva budhate. B<sub>1</sub> destroyed the savor of the expression as he edited *ardhaman avaha eva 'ratasammodahacintaya* etc., a nonsensical phrase, which prevented T from catching the intention of Somadeva.

Tar 16 147 and 118 contain a theory about dreams. They are threefold: one kind of dreams betokens something different from that what is dreamt, a second kind foretells the very

) This turn is frequent in Kathās. See I s 23, 6; 27 11 29, 13 4, 91 22 54 118 29

events which one has seen asleep, a third kind has no significance at all. In the text the three types are distinguished as *parāṁśa*, *yathāṁśa* and *apārṁśa*. In D the two śloka run thus

*śāpnaḥ cānekadhā 'nyārtho yathārtho 'partha eva ca,*  
*yah sadyah śucayaty artham anyārthah so 'bhidhiyate ||*  
*prasannadevatūdeṣarūpak śāpno yathārthah,*  
*gūdhūnabhaiḥ utūdikītam āhur apārthaham ||*

This is plain and interesting. B has edited the former śloka in this corrupted form

*śāpnaḥ ca 'aneka dhanyārtho, yathārtho 'pārtha eva ca*  
*yah sadyah śucayaty artham dhanyārthah so 'bhidhiyate*

Is it wonder that Tawney was perplexed how to get any sense out of it? see T I, 441 with note 1

At 121, 169 Br finding in his MSS *devāyārcṣaṇūya* = „for contemplating the temple”, divided it in this manner *devāgāre kṣaṇūya*, by which T (II, 350) was adduced to translate „took that wicked ascetic] to the temple for a moment”. It suffices to read the whole passage to understand the awkwardness of the reading of Br.

A remarkable misunderstanding of B disturbs the meaning of 59, 29. He took the first two syllables of the complex *māyāraopayogitū* for containing the proper name *Māya*. Hence T, having to translate these lines

*devīyam Castraganjajukhyas catvaredadharah śukah,* (28)

*kaṁśa kṛtsnāsu vidyāsu kalusu ca vācānāh*

*māyāraopayogitū ihāmito 'dya, gṛhyatam* (29)

rendered them as follows: „King, here is a parrot that knows the four Vedas, called Śāstraganja, a poet skilled in all the sciences and the graceful arts, and I have brought him here to-day by the order of king Māya, so receive him” (II, 19). The words I have italicized in this translation are to be corrected. There is no question of a king Māya. The Bhalla mruḍen simply says „I have brought him here” (*māya ihāmitaḥ*) „since he is suitable for a lord” (*raopayogitū*). In fact, *payogitū* does not mean „order”, but signifies the being *payogin* i.e. „suitable, fit, of utility”, cp 15, 127-113, 18 (*kim cānyānpayoginyā lakṣmya vidgudatolaya*) — Another instance of a proper name existing only in the idea of Br, but not really found in Somadeva's poem is Devayāmin 30, 130. Here must be read, as is in D *deva jāmānti*, *deva* is the voc., and *jāmānti* is the subject to be construed with the pronoun *evah* in the preceding line.

I could fill some pages more with augmenting the list of errors committed by B and corrected in D — in all the instances quoted D's text is right — but what utility may be obtained from it? What I have stated suffices I believe to prove that the task which Blochhaus took on his shoulders was inadequate to his abilities owing for a great deal certainly to the disfavor of the time he lived in when Sanskrit studies encompassed a very limited area and could be neither broad nor deep. Durgapada's edition, there can be no question about, has superseded nowadays the European text of the Kathasaritsigara and has become our sole standard edition, to be consulted and quoted up to that future day when a critical edition in the true sense of these words will have been published.

### § 3

The question may arise, why I have allowed in the foregoing so much room to expatiating on more or less evident mistakes and faults in an obsolete edition which has been replaced by a much better one in which the said errors are set right. I did so firstly because the necessity of putting aside a text which for some decades of years had enjoyed a great authority among the Sanskritists and was much consulted by them required a somewhat extensive account of argument. Secondly it might be of some use to remind editors of the ubiquity of clerical errors in manuscripts the emendation of which in cases of evidence must not be checked by the fortuitous circumstance that the faultless reading is not found in any of the mss. at the disposal of the editor. Certain permutations of initials owing to paleographical similarity or to likeness of pronunciation *dja* and *gla* *ma ya*, *pa sa za* and *se i* and *ra a* and *ra ca* and *ra* etc. etc. are so common that a critical editor is not only qualified but even obliged to bring them into account as a sort of cue when establishing the net weight and the value of the readings with which he happens to meet in a gross form in his manuscripts.

The third and I dare say the chief reason that moved me was this. The Petropoliitan Dictionary is very much indebted to the Kathasaritsigara. Boettlingk took care to profit of the paleographical materials laid up in that important text edited by a competent scholar at a time when the number of Sanskrit works in editions of European scholars was comparatively small. The imperfections of B, which fully came to light by the publication of D, have





evidently right in doing so. The  $\tilde{x}$ - $\varepsilon$ , *pratīpsati* is here synonymous with *abhīpsati*, as might be expected a priori. *āhutaṇḍya* PW V, 1134 idj *herbeizumessen* Kathās 110, 111 eine ungrammatische Form. D has the regular gerund *āhutaṇḍya*! cp PWK I, 197.

As to *udghata* and *upodyhata* t 71, 295 I refer to the following chapter:

*uparibhūmi* subst. ॐ, 70 not mentioned neither in PW nor in PWK. The latter mentions only *uparibhūmi* adv.

*upasamkhyā* PW V, 1191 and PWK I, 215, which Boethlingk was at a loss how to explain must be cancelled. For *upasamkhyā* t 71, 278 B, D has *upasamkhyām*. The right reading, I think, is *upasamkhyam* = 'towards the battle, -the war, in a warlike way'. P II, 228 has found out the right explanation of this *glōka*.

*ambhita*, quoted from t 51, 186 in PW V 1200 s v *ubh*, is a good correction of Boethlingk. B has *ratnastambhobhītabhogam*. The correction is confirmed by D. And not only here, but also in three places more *ambhita* has been restored in D, where B had failed to recognize that principle 49, 1 (*sumamalaganambhītabh* B *°gunamītabh*) 71 135 (*radhā saptaśarāmbhītabh*, B *°onmītabh*) 117 11 (*tatra ratnambhītabh* B *tatra ratnastambhītabh*)<sup>1</sup>). It may be rendered 'made up of, beset with'. I think it is indeed as is commonly accepted akin to the idg root *\*ubh* *\*ubh*, the offspring of which *unavabhi* is a welcome guest in linguistic handbooks. Of the Rgvedic instances quoted in PW I s v *ubh* I hold but one for belonging to this root *ubh* viz RV 1 1 15 the other two having a quite different meaning — 1 63 1 *Vitram ubhau* you killed [or vexed, or oppressed] *Vitram* and similarly 1 19 1 cp Sum on both passages — must be referred to another root *ubh*.

*ullughayati* 'to heal' lat 72 107 is a new instance to be added to the two recorded in PW V 1201 and PWK I 253. D and T's Cridentti MS read *ullughayan*, see P II, 191 note, in B it has been corrupted into *ullughayan*. I found also a good instance in *Āntrikhyāyika* (ed Hertel) II, 77.

*ekaka* and *ekika*. The distribution of these two forms of the fem of *ekaka*, instanced PW V, 1217 from Kathās, is the same in both B and D. Only add t 73 196 where D has *ekika*, B *ekaka*.

- lampra* A new instance of this adj. is t. 52, 49 D *lopakam prangasamdhikam*. This is preferable to *lopakampu* Br Cp *dypra* infra.
- karṇu* PW II, 127. Cancel the meaning 2 b), Steuermann-Schiffsmann Kathās 25, 68'. It rests on the bad reading of B: D reads *sudhayaṣṭaṭi catra teṣṭam dīpantaragacchadvantī arṇaparampara*. The term *karṇaparampara* = 'oral tradition, hearsay' is well known and recorded in PW even from the Kathās.
- karuratha* 'covered litter'. To the few instances registered in PW and PWK we may add Kathās 27, 168, where it is found in both editions, and two more passages met with only in D — the second of them also in 1 s MS — 91, 91 and 120, 118. Br in both cases failing to recognize the word, has torn it asunder, destroying the sense.
- karvejapa* is taught by Pīṇi (3.2.13) and recorded in PW and PWK occurs Kathās 60.54 D. The form *karṇajapa* found in B is a monstrous lectionis and must be cancelled in PW V. 1208 and in PWK II.
- kalana* s. v. *kalana* PW V, 1265. The proposal of Boehl to correct the meaningless reading of t. 100.57 Br *diṣa kalataya gira* etc. is superseded by the right reading of D *drakṇīṭi taya guru pramadamantharavambhaya* with eyes troubled (by agitation) and a voice faltering with joy.
- kakaranku* 32.32 must be registered in the lexicon as a nick-name for a superstitious person who sees omens in everything.
- kacara* PW V, 1275 is also found t. 20.108 D (B: *katara*) and t. 123.164 D (B: *lekara*) *kacarakṣu* and *kacarakocanah*.
- karṇama*. A good instance of *karṇama* = 'voice' is t. 26.198 D *tatra cupacyad ekūṭi sudhitanekakarmanam maluvatinam ekakam*. The word is hidden under a corruption apud B.
- karsaka* is instance PW V from t. 62.20.23 B: D has here *karsika* the same form occurs in both editions 61, 7.9.
- kinari* as name of a musical instrument 37, 64 D, where Br has *kinara* cp. PW II, 284 to be added in PWK s. v. 3 b).
- Kozala* f. Kathās 56.115. PW V, 1332 is to be cancelled. Br wrongly adopted a vicious reading of one or more of his MSS. D reads in this stanza (114 of his ed.) *jaṣṭama Kozalin*, as it ought to be.
- kottastha* t. 49.68 B: is doubtless a corrupted reading. D reads *kottasthāṭi Śuśakccarati*.
- Kibayasi* t. 101.126 B: The reading of D is *kibiyase* a form,

not registered in PW nor PWK, but more conform to the rules of grammar

*ḥṣam* cans PW II, 532 adduces one instance from the Rāmāyana for the meaning „etwas geduldig ertragen“ Lest one might acknowledge another instance in Kathās 39, 236 Bī *ḥṣamayasi*, I observe that the line in which this imperative occurs is too long by one syllable D reads that line *tatāparādham ekaṁ team ḥṣamasvāṣām kṛpām kṛm* and so restores both the metre and the idiom

*galla*, a prākṛitism for *ganda*, is illustrated by a few instances from literature in PW V, 9 v Add to them Kathās 63, 155, where D *utpurocchenagallam* is evidently right (Bī has *°galam*), cp Atri's Diet 9 v and the instance produced from Kāvya-prakāśa, a parallel to the Kathās passage

*grāha* as a nomen actionis is treated in PW II and PWK II s v. under c) In PW v 9 the meaning „Kampfanstrengung“ = *vanodyama* is taken from dictionaries, not instanced from literature An excellent instance is Kathās 50, 53 D, where Bīhūnā urges India to cease the hostilities *sandham kṛuta śam grāhāśh* „make peace, what have you to do with endeavours to fight one another?“ Bī has here a somewhat bewildering reading *sandham kṛuta vigrāhāśh* (50, 54 Bī)

*grāhika* quoted as ḡ-αῖ εἰρημεν from t 19, 16 Br in PW II „hartnäckig auf etwas bestehend“ D reads here *grāhaka*, likewise au ḡ-εἰ

The interesting word *ghanāghana* <sup>1)</sup> occurs t 16 121 D, where Bī *ghanāgama* is manifestly the bad reading

*ghṛt* + *ann*, (to kiss) instanced in PW VII 1103 with one place in Kathās (113, 50), must be cancelled Bī's text is here corrupted by a mis-reading, D *patroḥ padau aśudhyaya* „honouring his father-and-mother's feet“

*cavi*, *cavi* PW II, 983 „a kind of pepper“ The instance adduced there from Kathās 6, 151 is owing to a mistake of Bī and must be cancelled Instead of the non-sensical *Caratarmū ca vīhastāśh* D has *vīhastāśh Caratarmū ca vīhastā* = „perplexed, at a loss“ (PWK VI, 110 s v I d) <sup>2)</sup> Other instances in Somadeva are 90, 15 (*vīhastatā*) and the participle *vīhastita* (101, 98)

*cirandhi* PW V, 1123 quoted from Kathās 58, 56 and repeated

2 -

<sup>1)</sup> Cp *Alhami Kṛm*, p 43

<sup>2)</sup> BOUTINCK *apud LAMAR*, *Sanskrit Reader* p 92 corrects *Caratarmū ca vīhastāśh*

in PWK II 132 does not exist at all D reads here *cirantiṣu* conformably to the form known by grammarians and lexicographers We have here the Belegstelle from literature for *ciranti* 'old spinster' The word, methinks is a prakritism and a *taddhata* of skt *cirayanti* (चिरयन्ति) which has got the special meaning of 'staying (too) long (at the paternal home in fear of being transported to the home of a husband)

*cira* PW V 1423 Buchtingk's suspicion that *cira* Katha 73 240 (Br and D) should be corrected into *ciri* is fully confirmed by the parallel passage t 87 32 where D and 1 Ms (see his note 2 at II 295) agree in reading *ciricittāna* against *cira* Br At 73 210 the same must be corrected by conjecture

*chata* 62 213 Br is obscure Some villagers, it is told took a buffalo belonging to a certain man and *miti i vatatale chata i ite iyapadya blakatal* [vir malis tal]<sup>4</sup> Instead of this out of place absolutive D reads *blittat* 'The villagers were Bhils

Of *glampa* and *ḥpi* jump (see PWK III 281) but one instance is quoted from Katha in PW V s v There are two more but Br has them not since they are hidden under corrupt readings The former is t 103 8 in D it runs thus

*utphelur blattahinuu ṣramas blujacchinuu*  
*duḥ dattcordhaya jampant dnyastu na cumbatu*

( jumping, as if it were upward to the *ka* to *kas* the heavenly maidens ) [Br *utphetur blumacchinuu*

*dattcordhaya jampant dnyastu* (ie or is here some hypothetical error?) And t 115 68 D has *dattajhasipā patid bluv*

(cp f II 517 n 4)

*du ara* t 100 14 Br (see PW V s v) is a bad reading D has *jaya tmdavadarur i taida* I transport this quotation to *dar bara* cp. 107 5

*ḍaqlna* reaching to Add to the few instances from literature mentioned PW III s v, Katha 101 291 D *ḥulḥalagaḥ n oclatalllulan* (Br *gulḥalagaḥ*), cp 1 II 351 n 2

*dari try* t 49 210 Br is a misprint for *daudro* (49, 208 D), cp 2 I 169 n Happily PW does not record the vitiated word

*dipra* taught by Panini 3, 2, 167 and exemplified by the Kāṣika with *dipra i kṛṣṭa i* occurs five times in the Katha, once in t 25 where it is found in both editions which place it

registered in PW III s v, and four times in the latter part of the poem, where it stands only in D, not in Br t 101, 28 106, 61 182 110, 11 (Br everywhere changed, it seems, *dipin* into *dipta*)

*durgana*, ns adj PW, V 1500 Its form is met with t 39, 226 Br reads *rajnib durgana*! (acc pl), but D *durganib duhsarpa* 'eine hese Schlange' quoted from t 99, 46 in PW, V 1505 is a misreading Br divided the words of the line wrongly In D 99, 46 c and d run thus *ta te priya raemu yat tat kurva!* / *ti am me bandhuk saipadamçortihartu* therefore perform what I tell you moved by friendship! you are my relative, you who have relieved me from the distress caused by the bite of the serpent 1 s (II 361) translation is accordingly to be rectified

*dhar* + *gam* + *v* causative 'to suspend (a punishment) Kathas 27, 31 lacks in PW and PWK

*dharādharudha*, rightly interpreted by Boethlingk (PW, III s v) notwithstanding Br's mistake in t 6, 62, also occurs t 84, 9.

*dhārmika* with the special meaning of 'pious, religious man devotee' to be instructed with Kathas 66 8 foll

*Dhrtatula* is registered = *Yetalā* in PW, V s v from Kathas 69, 115 D has here *Yetalah* instead of *Dhrtatula*

*dhyā* + *ma* + *m* PW, III and V, s v The instance quoted V 1529 from Kathas 101 155 is false D has *atha m gram dhayati m abhavit* The other instance taken from the Bhīṣmavatapurāṇa must likewise be wrong *pa udaillyau* is a miswritten or misread *pramadadha*

*naṣṭatām ilā* = 'strung of (27) pearls PW gives but one instance from literature of this meaning It is met with in Kathas four times 91, 31 91, 62 100 1. (with a double meaning) 118, 161

*narmada* adj 'jesting' is wholly out of place Kathas 56 365 Br whence it has been instanced PW, IV 61 In D (56 364) Damayanti says more conformably to the situation *ta tada nayanayuktā manmatū kṛiyatām iyaṁ* ( the countenance which I have 'approved')

*namaganaka* 61, 252 D, v would be astrologer an astrologer nominally, not really This  $\tilde{a}^2$   $\tilde{u}_2$  is to be added to the two other examples of compounds of this type *namanan* and *namayajña* Br failed to see that *namaganakah* 11 is one word, he wrongly divided *nama ganaka*!

*nūśaka* = *nūśa* 2S, 141 Br and D is wanting in the Dictionary.  
*nirangī* 'veil' A new instance of this rare and decay-word is 71,  
 167 D *tām Kāmālākara upayame sanirangim* „K wed-  
 ded her, who had veiled her face” D explains the word  
 in a foot-note *mukhācchādanavastram nirangity ucyate*. Br  
*upayame sa ganirangim* 1)

*pādapū* = 'hoe' is recorded in PW, V But also the msc. *pādapa*  
 occurs in this meaning Kathās 67, 97 (both Br and D),  
 this is wanting in PW and PWK

*pūsanda* The fem *ī* occurs 61, 290 Br (cp PWK III, s v).  
 D reads *pukhandū* for *pūsandi*

*puṣarika* (name of some musical instrument) registered in PW V,  
 1600 from t, 65, 75, 78 Br, is written *piṣarika* in D  
*prāsthānika*, not *piasthānika*, as in Br's ed, is indeed found t.  
 31, 38 D, cp PW IV s v *prasthānika* I think, *kṛta-*  
*prāsthānikā* means „after performing the auspicious rite con-  
 nected with the undertaking of a journey”, cp the passages  
 from Rāmāyana and Raghuvamśa quoted in PW II and the  
 word *māṅgalika* infra *Tuwei* (I 275) translates as if it  
 simply meant 'setting out'

*preṣṭha* To the few instances of this superl may be added t 101,  
 15 D (*puram preṣṭhāya*, Br *purapṛiṣṭha*)

1 *phal* + *ut* in PWK, III s v The meaning 'to bounce up',  
 illustrated there with a passage of the Bāṇamīyana is also  
 met with Kathās 108, 132 D *kūro 'mitagalei cakasy*  
*utphalañ śasatah kṛdhā* Br has *utphullah*, an evident  
 corruption, of course

*balirāja* t 95, 4 means I suppose, 'tributary king' Cp the note  
 on this śloka in Chapt II

*bāudhavi* PW V, 1647 and PWK IV s v 2) must be cancelled  
 The sole instance given of it Kathās 121, 243 Br, is not  
 confirmed by D Instead of *bhartebāudhavi* it has *bhartr-*  
*bāudhar yān* [*irgam* etc, the abl of the abstract noun  
*bāudharaya*, not the dative of an hypothetical *bāudhavi*

*bhā* 'to please' is not found in PW, in PWK's v it is recorded  
 and exemplified with one instance from Boettlingk's *Chresth* 2  
 227, s [= (K 15 5) schol on Pāṇini 2, 3, 2] *bubhukṣitam na*  
*pati bhāti kimeś*, and Boettl doubts, whether *pratibhāti*  
 should not rather be taken for one word He did not mind  
 Kathās 21, 142 *bhāti e gen eva bhāty asya na i*

1) T II, 1:2 translates accordingly „marriage that has been made

'whether this man *pleases* him or not' *Bhāṭi* c gen, therefore, = *rocate* c gen

*mada* with the meaning 'musk' [= *mrgamada*] is registered with an asterisk in PWK (V, 12 s v 1). It is met with in Kathās t 82, 33, but lies hidden under a corruption in B. In D this *śloka* is edited thus *yeyam cūkhandaḥaparakālāgauru madottamam / kṛtaprasādhana* etc

*mahātāla* is not „kostbares Oel“, as it has been rendered in PW and PWK, but 'humour fat'. See Tawney I, 306 n and his translation of t 73, 306 and 99, 4, cp also *mahāmāmsa māṅgalika*. To the one instance of meaning 2) registered in PWK, V s v this may be added Kathās 115, 156. D has doubtless the right reading *Ṣakrah Caccracita māṅgalīlāh prastāhe*, Br *°mangalalāh*

*mantrika*, 'schleichst fur *mantrika*' PW and PWK s v. Likewise Kathās 121, 12 Br *mantrilāh* is corrected in D *māntrilā o diplomantia* 'pn etc

*yuddhaka* = *yuddha* PW, VI s v and PWK, V s v must be cancelled. The sole place, where it is found, is Kathās 49, 71. B. King Māhīśena, while besieging some vessel (*kottastha*, cp *supra*, p 79 s v *kostkastha*) is himself besieged by Vikramakṛti. Being thus obstructed, he says to his excellent minister Guṇḍamān

*ekam yuddham sthitaḥ vanto yuddhak sma nyena satimna  
tad idam aparyuptaḥ katham yudhyumahe dayah'*

= „While we are occupied in besieging one enemy we are besieged by another, so now how we are to fight with two enemies, as we are unequal in force? (T I, 162) and asks this question more

*ayuddhe yuddhake irah sthasyumaḥ ca tyacnam'*

What may this mean? Strictly speaking *ayuddhe yuddhake* even if the latter word should be = *yuddhe*, is here nonsensical, and P's translation „without fighting a battle“ is very forced. But D has *ayuddhe yuddhake irah* etc, that solves the riddle. *Ruddhaka* = 'enclosure' or rather the state of being enclosed, besieged. Transl. „how long, being brave men, are we to be kept shut in, without fighting?“

*raṭhanḡanūman* Bochtlingk's correction (PW, VI s v) of Kathās 104, 112 is confirmed by D. The same error of Br against the genuine reading of D is also met with t 55, 116

1 *ras* PW, VI s v. The instance quoted Kathās 108, 106 is false. Not *rasat* (B) but *rasat* (D) is the right reading. The



compound in full is *raktalīptalāśatkhadgalatujhāl* the sword red with blood is compared to a tongue Cp T II 455, n 1

*vajjalilayita* an *z-* *u-* registered in PW VI s v as occurring Kathās 43 59 and repeated in PWK, represents the reading of Br only D has *vajjāo lilayitam*

Of *rista* (n) = 'distress calamity' registered in PW, VI s v 1 ris 3) a certain instance is Kathās 115 54 D The 4<sup>th</sup> pida of this śloka *tamam ristam śarīrāśanam na* preparing calamity as if it were to the celestials represents doubtless the genuine text Br s *tamam ristam* is a corruption thereof, T is at a loss how to explain it see his n 1 on II, 517 — The variance t 116 1 *tany arisam* (D) *tany arisam* (Br) is more doubtful At 119 160 both editions have *amśaṣaṅkinah*

*ru* + *at* + *u* PW VI s v *Ityarudha* exorbitant is the right reading Kathās 61 251 (D) not *anyarudha* Br which is void of sense in that context

*luth* + *us* With respect to the caus PW and PWK omit to mention the meaning to demolish to overturn [a building] Kathās 76 30 Br and D and 121 180 D In the latter place Br has erroneously put into the text *nirlocya tad* (I II 580 take this into consideration and ) instead of *nirloṭhya tad* demolish this (temple) and [level it with the earth]

1 *caṣa* PW VI 820 The meaning 2) unter Inds Befehlen stehend unterthan abhängig is among other instances, exemplified with Kathās 81 102 But D has *saṁśalāṁ caṣe tava* [not *caṣa* as Br] agreeably to the usual idiom

*vidāraṇa* PW VI 1056 The meaning sub 3) *d* *das* Abwesen, Zurückweien instanced with Kathās 26 63 is based on the wrong reading of this śloka in Br The right one is edited in D

*tava vilya haras tī s tva caran udhato talin  
pitar vidāraṇam kṛte kanyāśulopyaśam sthite ||*

T's translation (I 223) For the reason though my father has recommended to me many Vidūdhara suitors I have rejected them all and remained unmarried up to this day is accordingly in want of a slight modification She does not say she rejected the suitors but she checked (*cl struck / stopped*) her father in his design This is the meaning of *vidharaṇa* to the instances thereof quoted in PW, add

Avadānaśatakā I 223, 15 *bhagavan rajamāge nyatamena brahmanena vidharita itī* — Blochhaus must have written *vidharanam* by some mistake of the kind as is pointed out, *supra* p. 72

*vidhura* substantive = *sapafni* (Kathas 39, 55) is not mentioned in PWK

*visrāta* is exemplified in PW s v with but two instances, one from the Rgvedasamhitā and one from the classic Sanskrit. This place is Kathas 20, 157 B, but D has *sarātra*. An exact account of the evidence to be obtained from manuscripts is much wanted here but it is missing!

*vanatya* Bochtling! PW s v, understood that this  $\tilde{a} - \epsilon$ , in t 60, 145 B is a corruption and conjectured *vanatyaṃ etī* 'becomes estranged'. D has *vanatyaṃ etī*, which is doubtless the genuine reading.

*cabala* PW s v establishes the meaning 1 c) 'entstellt verändert' and quotes several instances from the Bhāgavata purāṇa. Kathas 51, 235 D is a new instance *tanuśāpāntīlānam cabala dāmarasanaṃ* = in the mind of those abandoned to the intoxication of love the idea of duty and religion is distorted. Br has *capala* instead of *cabala* a bad reading which disfigures the purport of the sentence.

§ 18 + *śamī* + *ut*. The phrase *śamīśīṣṭa* = ritually impure is forgotten in PW VII s v 3 § 18.

1 the causative 4) PW s v. The meaning *rocayati* is exemplified with one instance Kathas 19, 84. But D has not *rocayati* but *arodhayati* (*daritam śrātoyade pratyogam arodhayati*) which is preferable for this reason that *rodhayati* 'purifies' is conformable to *śuddhaye* as pure but not so *rocayati* with this meaning to *rocate*. For this reason I think *Varanasi Yogiśāstra* 7, 11 (Ind. Studien XV, 168) *rocayati* is also to be corrected into *rodhayati* cf. PWK s v *roc*.

*ceśya* PW VI, 299 'bei Sate zu lesen: fernerer Berichtigung nicht werth' is instanced with but one case Kathas 71, 213 where this meaning is forced. II 225 translates (to be) only worthy of neglect which lies still farther off. In fact, the gerundive of *śī* is not at its place in the passage quoted, and D has instead of it *śīlpaḥ* = very insignificant. B's *ceśya* is certainly corrupt and must be cancelled in the Dictionary.

*samjuana* 'The quotation Kathas 101, 188 in PW VII s v 1 a) is to be put aside. Since there is no question there of

resuscitation", but simply of life 'opposite to death', D's reading *sa jīvanapramayayoh* etc. is the right one, not Br *samjīana*°

*samnyasa* with the meaning of 'rejection' Ueberenkunft', PW VII, 654 s.v. 4) and PWK VII 16 s.v. 5) does not exist at all. The sole instance of it, the quotation Kathas 4, 36 Br is corrupt. Instead of *kitasamnyasa* D has *kitasamdhāsa*, it is *samkhu* not *samnyasa* that means 'Ueberenkunft'. *saptaka* n. 'Heptad'. The quotation Kathas 43, 13 in PW VII s.v. should rather be omitted. D has the good reading *mastaka* instead of *saptaka* (Br) and reads accordingly the line in this manner *meva esya samarnapuramastakabhinah / abhyan tarām* etc. = he entered within it [viz. that palace] which possessed the greatest beauty of the Golden Town.

*sabhojayati* to render homage (to) is instanced in PW with Kathas 62, 8. It occurs also Kathas 16, 25 D *tatal sabhojayan anyan* etc. where B. falsely reads *tatal sa bhujayann*, for the pronoun *sah* is thereby present in the same sentence. Likewise B. disregarded *sabhojana* in Kathas 15, 362 *sabhojanaya ca prapat Prahladaya abham yayan* he reads *sabhojanaya* — to take his meals (1 I 131) destroying thereby the meaning of that passage as Somadeva intended to say that he went to the hall of P. to pay his respect.

*sampadati* t. 4) 366 must be a false form as Boettlingk supposed already. PW VII s.v. The Bibu Sāma Chinn's conjecture *sammadati* mentioned by 1 I 131 n. and recorded PWK VII 68 is certainly right. Somadeva uses the word *sammada* (joy) oftener than should be inferred from the few quotations of it from Kathas in PW s.v. It occurs also 19, 64 D *caradā dattasammadah* (Br °*sampadah*) 26, 287 *sammadamayan* *duṣam* (both edit.) 104, 51 D *dattasammada* cp. 7 II, 114 n. 2 108, 121 too, D has *bheja kamapi sammadam* against B. *kamapi sampadam*.

*śilayyaka* quoted PW s.v. from Kathas 17, 18 and 35, 208 is spelt in both places *śilayaka* in D. Yet cp. PWK s.v.

*śulita* 'satirated'. To the scanty instances from classical Sanskrit, quoted in PW s.v. may be added Kathas 66, 35 Kern's opinion (Journ. R. Asiat. Soc. II) that *śulitasya* (B.) ought to be corrected into *śulitasya* is fully confirmed by D, where the line runs thus

*śulitasya kṛt ca dāna śulitasyaṇe ca kṛt*

*Śulite* for *śulita* is likewise written Avadīnacataka I,

189, 7 cp the Index of my edition s v At Int I 266  
14 we have an instance of *sukta* in Pih

*suti* 'Niederkunft = child birth The quotation Kathis 64 5  
must be cancelled D reads *sutakante* not *sutikale* the  
reading of Br The woman goes to the river to bathe at  
the end of the *stala*, the impurity caused by child birth  
verily not at the time of her delivery (*sutula*)<sup>1</sup>

*sutrapitam* h and ca s v *sutra* 2) Meschum PW and PWK  
The signification could be better delimited I I 93 n 3  
translates to test, likewise I 197 where he renders Kathis  
21 93 The expression answers, indeed almost to Latin  
'periculum facere'

*sphury* + *sam* is to be added in PW and PWK The putic of the  
present act of this verb is met with t 96 12 D *tatal*  
*siyanasasiphrjadarinnalatatanam* etc Br has *tatal*  
*siyanasasiphrjad*<sup>2</sup>

*siaray* Kathis 96, 3 must be cancelled in PW s v The right  
reading is *nagarecatal* (D) *siaray* is a simple appellative  
is uncommon and even if it were not so it would be less  
proper in that context

*scantant* I think this 2- s in t 37 25 (in both editions)  
is genuine (cp the notes of D and I I 336 n 1) and take  
it for a synonym of *scanta* = *manes* or *Idaya*

*lahu* l where (PW VII s v) Kathis 28 24 D *lah* against  
Br *la la*

### § 4

The possession of a better edition affords also the advantage of  
getting rid of some grammatical singularities in the text of the  
Kathasaritgiri about which formerly it was more or less uncertain  
how to account for They mostly concern verbal forms  
and a few syntactical blunders

D is as constant in exhibiting *abracari* as Br in the barbarism  
*abritam* cp Kern Journ R As Soc II p 169 D is not so  
correct in the case of c negligently put for *ai* in verbal forms from  
the root i c g 37, 51 where the *viksm* says to Nigeyaditta  
*alam yam njan stlanam arjuna* [= redibo] *ca nriyatie* both  
editions *eyam* against the obvious meaning Likewise 43 266  
86, 34 etc, 62, 71 to correct *amy akam* for the edited *emy*  
*alam*

Var 16, 72 Br has *lableya* n, but D *lableya* the middle voice

as usual. In the same way the uncommon active of  $\mu + para$  t 72 67 Br is not found in D it has *rade parajayeta tām* (Br *rade parajayed etam*) Boettlingk's correction *paricyate* t 45, 247 (PW VI s v *viç + pra*) is confirmed by D — *Bhāṇjam* t 62, 112 is corrupt, D has *bhājam* ep I II 73 n 2

The present of  $\epsilon$  (to choose to adhere) according to the 5<sup>th</sup> class is met with t 66 109 Br *sattakinnari na irimate iriyak* D *imate* according to the 9<sup>th</sup> class Both forms are grammatically good

The ungrammatical aorist *aprasṭa* 29 62 Br disappears in D, whose reading *ten aprṣṭa śayampabhū* (a bhūvūhu) is doubtless right On the other hand D restores in two places the aorist of  $\nuç$  (37 197 *upavikṣan* 38 102 *pravikṣat*) where Br has imperfects which disturb the metre, ep t 12 156

In 1868 Kern (II p 176) had already intimated that *craddatāt* t 103, 93 Br is a monstrous lectio and should be corrected into *craddadūh* So indeed is edited in D The other monstrous *uktavatyau* t 121, 20 is also limited to Br D has *uktavatyau* Nor is *Irṣan* or *dIrṣan* (t 53 130 Br) found in D — the line in question is edited there as follows *tac chritāna ca so radid dhr̥sto* (rejoiced) *Ṭṇaro dīyat* — And t 121, 192 where Br produces in absolute *anuvajya* (sic) = having propitiated (see PW VI 232 s v *raj + anu*, cns 2) D has the right reading *anuvajya* likewise D corrects the vicious *vajyāta* t 86 109 of Br it reads *tat/vajyāta si r̥gn̄* — Another vicious form is the infinitive *vajyam*, t 98 15 Br (not mentioned in PW) instead of it D has, of course, *noṣṣi* Kern in his paper mentioned above corrected also *yujatyāt* t 106 21 both editions have the faulty *yujantjāt*

*Mamathuk* t 16, 220 Br is a legitimate various reading of *vamantluk*, D Perhaps also *drillayati* 16 10 Br of *drallayati* (D) in *Prabodhacandrodaya* V, stanza 28 Brockhaus like we edited *drillayati*, whereas the *Nannasagara* ed. of 1898 of that drama (p 189 st 22) reads *drallayati* also *Ṭṇaranda* *Vidyā* *Ṭṇaras* ed. of 1871

Has Somadeva used the liberty granted to epic poetry of omitting the augment? According to Br's edition one would be inclined that he availed himself of that licence but sparingly The few cases, however, of its being wanting are checked by the veto of D<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>4)</sup> T 13 11 D has *abā a d ta* but here (Br) *b n t* is preferable

Compare

Br 50	160	<i>canurañjayat</i> ,	with D (50, 159) <i>canurañjayat</i>
51,	209	<i>atvuhayat</i> ,	, D <i>atyavuhayat</i>
57,	135	<i>mbadhyata</i>	, D <i>nyabadhyata</i>
, 65,	180	<i>puluvany avalokayat</i> ,	, D <i>puluvani yalokayat</i>
71	51	<i>praveṣayat</i> ,	, D <i>praveṣayat</i>
96,	16,	<i>alalambayam</i>	, D <i>adalambayam</i> , a preferable

reading also for this reason that *alalambayam utmanam* — not *mal* — is the typical expression for committing suicide by suspending one's self

Br 72, 39 *arcayat*, but D *arcayat* Nevertheless, D ordinarily agrees with Br in the absence of the augment in the case of a verb commencing by *a* followed by two consonants It is especially wanting in the imperfs *arpayat* and *samarpayat* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> pāda (10, 100 205 213, 12, 27 172 1) 13, 101, 23, 31, 24, 105, 27, 112 29, 161 33, 17 35, 17, 38, 45 39, 201 13, 127 11, 25 155 45, 179 16, 15, 54 226, 61 288 73 301 74, 267 90, 55 102, 133 103, 25 117 117 119 27 121, 232, 233 123 102 124 314 124 121 197) cp *samarpayata* 70 20 *samarpayata* 72 51 Of the kind see also *asnat* 12, 68 *adasyata* 121, 52 D has also *abhyasyat* 13, 271, but here Br *abhyasyan* (participle) seems to me the better reading At t 118, 81 D reads *ardayan* *Malayadhayah* against Br *ardayat*

Somadeva therefore seems to have altogether abstained from imperfects and aorists without augment (the aor with *im* of course, excluded), save this case of *a* + two consonants In this respect he contrasts with his rival Kacchendra, who — if we may trust the printed text — admitted of imperfects without augment rather freely e.g. Bihkm p 254, 176 p 413 21 p 151 11 p 153 36 p 456, 76

At t 101, 91 it is D that has the incorrect passive *galyate* the right form *galyate* is in Br

Several times there is variance in the two editions in such cases, where both forms are good Br has *kaṣṭa* 21, 28 22, 202 61, 161 77, 36 D everywhere *kaṣṭa* The same applies, it seems, to such orthographies as *ḍakṣiṇi* — *ḍakṣiṇi* *koṣṭika* (D) — *kaṣṭikā* *jetṭ* — *peḍi* *chagala* — *chagala*, *kuttani* — *kuttini* *picchala* — *picchala*, *bahula* — *bakala*, *kṣurika* — *churika*, *dhattaraka* — *dhustaraka* *praghanika* — *prahanika*, *tittibha* — *tittibha*, *peyusa* — *piyusa*

<sup>1</sup>) But t 12 61 D has *sa arpayat* against Br *sa arpayat*

In part of them one of the forms is nearer to the original *Pañcī*.

From a syntactical point of view it may be observed that D now and then restores *enam* and the like in such cases as where *etam* etc found in B<sub>1</sub> are less correct or inversely, e.g. 42, 177 D so 'py *enam* [B<sub>1</sub> *etam*] *agrat*, bnt 45, 368 D *Sumundikam caitam* [B<sub>1</sub> *ca 'enam*] At t 19, 183 D and 50, 195 D both editions have wrongly *etam* for *enam*.

Tu 118, 100 B<sub>1</sub> *yuyam prayatam Patalam* do you much to Pitali? D reads *yuyam prayatam* 'The connection of the plural of the pronoun subject with the dual of the imperative predicate is apparently due to some oversight of B<sub>1</sub>. The same must be said of 20, 152 *na etam tadit* B<sub>1</sub>, in D we find *manam tadit*, as must be expected a priori and cp the similar passage 108, 47. Nor can I anyhow believe that B<sub>1</sub> found in his manuscripts that which is edited 12, 58 *darabhyam* for *darabhyo* (D) such a dual being unheard of.

The rare instance of an accusative cum infinitivo t 20 172 B<sub>1</sub> *erantah kamapi vijunam snatum tatva dadarva ca*, which I have quoted in my *Sanskrit Syntax* p 307 n 3 fills away D reads *snantam*, the participle wanted here!

The 1 pers of the imperative *kathari pibam* t 61 238 B<sub>1</sub>, though good in itself had become uncommon in Somadeva's days. It is not met with in D which has *kathari pibami*. Here and in the preceding case it is impossible to guess how far B<sub>1</sub> went in his modification of the text he found in his manuscripts.

Tu 15 400 Br contains a modus irrealis expressed by a conditional in the ipodosis and an aorist (!) in the protasis as follows *bhaskarasyad asmatkrodhagnis tam agham iyadhas tac cet* = 'The fire of my wrath would have reduced thee to ashes, if thou hadst committed that sin'. Yet it is not Somadeva, but B<sub>1</sub> who is liable to that syntactical sin. D reads — and manifestly, he is right — *agham iyadhasyacet*.

Here are some other cases of syntactical irregularities put away.

1 In t 84 the tenth Veda-tale, cl 11 relates that a certain thief saw Madanacandā and rushing upon her, *sewed her by the hem of her garment* (P II, 280). The words I have italicized render Br's *kenapi rurdhe vasanañcalit*. Instead of that abl, which is hard to be accounted for, D has the locative *vasanañcale* conformably to the use, cp my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 139 d — 2 The structure of the sentence t 58, 11 Br *prag eva mama nudistam kivi deva nāddhunopi tat* is clumsy, in D its elegance is restored since *gat* takes the place of *tat* — 3 The singular *artale* and the inter

punctuation in t 118, 121 impair the meaning of the context and B<sub>1</sub>, who erroneously joins *varānta* with *prāptakalāh*, this word is an adjective qualifying *darasamgrahah*. This is plain in D

*vijitah śaharāh, putā, yurānan bhāūtanā yuram,*

*svādhinā rājānyam ca, mayā tuc ca garentah*

*varāntē, prāptakalāh tat kīyatam darasamgrahah —*

4 The use of a dual of the neuter gender *paritrite*, t 123 185 B<sub>1</sub>, to express the common predicate of the two subjects *puram Pātaliputram* and *Deśalah putā* is singular, and D's reading *paritritas tad agūh* etc must be considered the right one Cp t 121, 218 — 5 The interpunction of t 105, 37, is edited in B<sub>1</sub>, is proper to lead astray the reader *yathā yathā vicimāno, na tām prapā tathā tathā* I, at least, troubled myself to account for that partic of the present *vicimānah* with the function of a verb finite, but afterwards, when I read the same passage over in the non interpuncted edition of D, it was immediately clear to me that B<sub>1</sub> ought to have interpuncted *yathā yathā vicimāno na tām prapā, tathā tathā / teṣu teṣu pradeṣeṣu* so 'bhīamat. Verily, it is better to edit Sanskrit texts with nāgarī types and little interpunction than in transcription and with Occidental fulness of stops semi-colons, signs of exclamation and interrogation etc. These signs are better dispensed with

### § 5

Durgaprasād and his collaborator were better Sanskritists than Brockhaus, they availed themselves of his *editio princeps* moreover, they had the good chance of having in their possession an excellent manuscript not known to their predecessor. So they could carry out an edition of the *Kāthasamīśāgarā* in many respects superior to that of the European scholar. I have stated above that nevertheless their work cannot be called a critical edition nor has it the pretension of making this claim. Inaccuracies and bad readings are not wanting in this better text too. Now and then, B<sub>1</sub>'s text is even preferable. This is chiefly the consequence of typographical errors and misprintings, easily recognizable as such and less adapted to misleading than the errors and mistakes of Br. Another drawback for Hindoo editors is the right division of the words according to the standard of European and American use, something unfamiliar to minds accustomed to the *scriptio continua*. Errors in this respect are not wanting neither, but they are easy to be detected. The first edition of D contained a *śuddhapatram*



with a great number of corrections, yet not complete, this list is not added to the 2<sup>d</sup> edition — my copy is from 1903 — but the editors have, of course, corrected their text accordingly. The accuracy in revising it was, however, not so great as to forbid new typographical errors to make their appearance e.g. 42, 172 *jagama* D<sup>1</sup> and Br, *jagada* (quite nonsensically) D<sup>2</sup>, — 45, 398 *na ca tasyeccha utathu* D<sup>1</sup> and Br, *na ca tasyecchumi tathu* (sic) D<sup>2</sup>, — 54, 32 *udbhuta*° D<sup>1</sup> and Br, *udbhutā*° D<sup>2</sup> — 64, 101 *panamatta* D<sup>1</sup> and Br *panavatta* (nonsense) D<sup>2</sup>. Upon the whole the amount of such inaccuracies and misprints is not too great for a text edited in India by Indian scholars and such cases as 62, 72 *litlyudhak*, 71, 255 *vrayogarnavottirnan* instead of *litvadhak* and *vrayogarnavottirnan*, where the oversight of the error of the typographer who put one wrong *ksara* for the right one destroys the understanding of the whole sentence, are comparatively rare.<sup>1)</sup>

Another side of the shortcomings of the learned pundits measured by the standard applied to Western scholarship, however laudable their work may be from a veridical point of view shows itself in the following. The editors have taken Br's text for the base of their edition. This was the most natural course to be followed even if they had not explicitly named Br together with the two manuscripts as the three *pastakam* which were the sources of their text, we would consider it a matter of course that they made the 'editio princeps' the groundwork of their own performance. I suppose, they will have marked their corrections and modifications in some copy of Br. Yet in doing this useful work they could have been a little more careful. Now and then it is likely some faults of Br have passed over in their edition, by want of accuracy, not because the same faults are in their manuscripts. In the beginning of t. 71 Virginkudatta rescues a Çabara king from drowning in the river. The grateful prince offers him his friendship and assistance, and invites him as his guest

*lat prasadam kuruvaite grham bhrtasya te prabho*

„So do me the favour, my lord of coming to my palace, since I am your slave" (F. II, 154). It is clear, that *bhrtasya te* must be read. Both editions, however, have *bhrtasya me*. The mistake of Br remained unchanged by inadvertence of D. Other instances are 21, 96 Br and D *bheje 'parani crijam*, though it is evident that *bheje parani crijam* is meant, 73, 396 *baddhi* Br and D

<sup>1)</sup> Cp. also 103 b D *para lāṅgha* : a no essential reading, for \*grāṇa Tar 34, 20. Br *ta* is doubtless preferable to D *sa*.

for *vadhva* cp 'T II 212, with his wife', 25, 216 *tasmanñi* for *tasāmñi*, 63, 175 foll *pralīta* for *prakīta*. In this respect, the 2<sup>d</sup> edition is somewhat better. 31, 1 D<sup>1</sup> with B has the ungrammatical participle *kuranti*, D<sup>2</sup> *kurati*. 18 5 D<sup>1</sup> with B the barbarism *bhūdanti*, D<sup>2</sup> *bhūdanti*.

It would be useless to deal longer or fuller with this subject. Even if I succeeded in drawing a complete list of all those cases where D's readings are inferior to those of Br, the profit would be small. Taking all in all, D is the standard edition nowadays and ought to keep this worth up to that future time, when the text of the Kathāsaritsāgara, critically revised in the strict sense of the word, and with help of all manuscripts available duly selected and classified, will lay before us.

## CHAPTER II.

### LIST OF PASSAGES, THE TEXT OF WHICH HAS BEEN IMPROVED IN D

After expounding in the preceding chapter the progress obtained for the understanding of our text by the edition of D, we will now proceed to make up a list of the more important cases of improved readings, not yet mentioned in the foregoing. Sometimes the meaning of the text is greatly modified by them, sometimes the bearing of the change is less, but I have avoided from noticing such corrections — and they, too, are numerous — as are of no consequence for the understanding

- 1, 42 D *tacca tatsamecayayaua* with a meaning more appropriate than that of the text of Br, also the metre is improved Cp T I, 3 n
- 61 D *mokṣyate*, the 3<sup>d</sup> person is indispensable, as Çaivānī does not address Māhvant Bī *mokṣyase* will not do here
- 5, 11 D *pañcabhūḥ mitatāḥ kim yaḥ jagatīha na sūdhyaḥ*, doubtless right, *im na* being, as usual, = *saḥam aḥ*, Bī *kīyat*
- 133 D *śākaṣṇam* 'cater of vegetables', instead of Br *śālāṣaṇam*, meaning T already detected the fault, cp his translation I, 31, n 2
- 6, 20 D *ganūcāturo jāto 'yam Gunūdhyaḥ*, where Bī *gunūcāturo* etc., hence T translates „this child is an incarnation of virtue”, *what ought to be*, an incarnation of one of his Gūṇas” Another instance of confounding *gūṇa* and *gana* is at 15, 368 In D the similar mistake has been made 114, 70, Bī has here the right reading
- 32 In the pleasant story of the merchant Musaka it is related that he was born after his father's death and that this mother, having lost her property by the wickedness of his relations, educated him in poverty From lack of

money to pay a teacher, she persuades some teacher to give him some instruction by way of charity. Here B's reading (which has also passed into Lammann's *Reader* p 40) *upādhyāyam athābhyaithya tayā kīmcana dīnayā* is not satisfactory, what may here be the use of *kīmcana*? The good reading is of course (D) *tayā kīmcanya-dīnayā*, 'she, deserving compassion because of her poverty (*ākīmcanyā*)'

86 Instead of B *ity evam uddeṣe*, which T could not render properly, D has *ity evam taddeṣe*

150 T translates well „and the king for his part was comforted”, but this is not expressed by B's *ṣastak*, but by the text as constituted in D *vājāpy ubhayaṭaḥ siddhim matvāṣvastō bahūna sah*

In other passages, too, B has failed with respect to the verb *ṣas*: 25, 201 D and T *saṁāṣṛasya* (B *saṁāṣṛasya*), 33, 173 D *viṣṭāsyā* (B wrongly *viṣṭasya*), 106, 100 D and T *kiṭāṣvāsū* (B *kiṭā 'āṣā*)

7, 5 Ciryavimān narrates to his king his journey to Kāthikēy's shrine in order to obtain the help of that god to fulfil his extraordinary promise. When, *being near his aim*, he fell senseless on the ground, exhausted by austerities and fatigue, some allable man, so he said, had comforted him and taken away his hunger and thirst. The words I have put in italics are so corrupt in the original text of B, that T could not find out their meaning. D gives them in their genuine shape, editing *tato 'dhoanī manakheṣe jāle* 'when there was (still) little remaining of the way'

79 It must not be read with B *putro me pūṣṭakā kṛpā* (T „my son has been sent away somewhere”) but with D *prōṣṭak* 'my son is abroad somewhere'

81 D *saṁutsarjya* preferable to B *saṁutpatya*

10, 12 Cūṇ gratifies her worshipper Kālanem with the promise that he shall become wealthy and obtain a son who shall rule a kingdom, yet himself shall be put to death in an ignominious manner, „because thou hast offered flesh in the fire with impure motives”. T has translated so from B *kulam agnau tayā yasmād amīṣam kalusātmanā*. The offering of flesh looks somewhat strange in this place, as the preceding *ślokas* mention only libations (*homās*) offered to the goddess of Fortune. The right reading is

found in D *yasmād amariṣa kaluzulmanā* 'because thou hast offered libations with a mind troubled by anger'

- 47 D *ṛṇyaya* suits better the structure of the period than Br *ṛṇya ca*

- 11, 6 B's reading *ekā Vasavadattakhyā kanyā kamayate param* ('the maiden named V alone has a liking for me') purports an impossibility. At this point of the tale Udayana, who speaks these words, either did not know Vāsavadattā at all or only by name. Moreover, the tale itself makes her fall in love with U a long time there after and in consequence of a contrivance of U. The right reading is in D *ekā Vasavadattakhyā kanyā kṛṇyate param* etc. = there is but one maiden they say (that suits me as a wife)

- 52 What may be the meaning of the last word of the line *sa tam praty abravīd evam manmathajñānuvandina* (Br)? Since there must be expressed by that phrase that Angirarati spoke so moved by love towards Candamahādeva D's reading *manmathajñānuvartina* is of course, to be adopted

- 12, 49 ff. Yaugandhuyana associates himself with the brahmarīkṣas Yogeśvara who chose him as his friend, as is rightly said in D *mitrabhāṣaya utatam abhyetya*, whereas B confounding the akṣaras *dī* and *i* — see *supra*, p. 70 — has *dhitatam upetya*. Thanks to a charm taught to him by that friend, Y altered his shape changing himself into a deformed hunchbacked old man with the appearance of a madman, *umattareṣaḥ* in B must be of course 'read', the words that follow 'in Br *khalv attakhyasampananā* (cf. 51) cannot be genuine, for *attakhyā* does not simply mean laughter and is wholly out of place here. From D it appears that he was bald, too, *khalvato hasyasampananāḥ*. In cf. 52 D has *śanaddhaprthūlarāṇi* for B's *śanaddham pr*<sup>o</sup>

- 64 D *imatantrinyogitaṇ rājñe smai sa samarpayat* B has here *\*yocitaṇ* (typographical error?) and *\*smai samam arpayat*

- 14, 16 In the tale of the clever deformed child this boy says to his father 'Papa, I have two pupils' So the boy said every day, and his father suspecting that his wife

had a puerile, would not even touch her" This the child spoke „with suppressed voice", as Tawney translates Br's *ardhaviṣṭayā girā*, = 'mut leiser Stimme' in his German translation This 'suppressed voice, though not contrary to the situation, can never be meant by the quoted words of the text, *ardhaviṣṭa* signifies 'occupied —, possessed for the half' D has the appropriate expression *avispaṣṭayā girā*, 'with his articulate voice', as he was a little child

i, 57 D *bhāveṇa vyabhicārinah*, 'prescribable to B' *bhāvet sū vyabhicārin*

i, 46 D *arasarām daduh* more in conformity with the idiom than Br *daduh*

91 According to Br, Vāśavadattī accompanied the army incognito „ascending a comfortable carriage sent by Padmāvatī, with its great horses also put at her disposal by her (P)" As she is said to have got a carriage, it was not necessary to add that she obtained it with its horses Somadeva, indeed, does not narrate so instead of *tanmahaturagāḥ* (Br) we find in D *tanmahattarakāḥ*, attendants of rank and high personages were put at her disposal; besides the carriage

121 When the celestial voice has testified with ringing sound to the innocence of Vāśavadattī, all bystanders are astonished and rejoiced like peacocks hearing the pleasant sound of thunder In this likeness the epithet *udiyatkarah* 'with uplifted hands' of Br is less appropriate than D's ringing *utkandharaḥ ca sūnam* etc., for uplifting the neck towards the celestial apparition does apply as well to the king's attendance as to the peacocks

7, 19 In the myth of Pururava and Urvashi it is told how Indra after vanquishing the demons made a great feast This *utsavaḥ* is characterized in Br by the epithet *pranṛtāsaravadvasarthah* (P „a feast, at which all the nymphs of the heaven displayed their skill", Geldner *Fed Studien* I, 237 „ein Fest, an welchem die Himmelsmädchen theilnahmen") Better D *pranṛta* 'where the Ap-sarasas executed their dances' Cp *supra*, p 70

32 King Udayana by his narration of the adventures of Urvashi had abashed a little his wife Vāśavadattī suspecting a disguised reproof of her own conduct Yaśodhanarājan, in order to dispel that thought from her

mind and to apprise her, begins to narrate some other story about a wife who loved her husband most sincerely. This is said in clear and plain words in D

*tām dīṣṭā yuktīpālābhām rājñā deṣam ulakṣitam*

*a thāpyāyayitum bhūpam āka Yaugandharāyanak ||*

Br has here *tathā 'apy āpayitum*, which cannot mean 'to make him feel in his turn' [T] („um ihn auch etwas empfinden zu lassen" Brockhaus' own transl.) and is obviously non-sensical

73 foll

The merchant Dharmanugupta, knowing that his daughter Sourprabhā must not be given in marriage, concealed her, yet a young merchant, Guhacandra beheld her on the occasion of the spring festival and no sooner had he got sight of her, than *sa manobhavarallīyeta sadyo hrdayalagnayā / tayā mumurecheṣa* (Br), which in T's translation is rendered „she clung like a creeper of love round his heart, so that he was, as it were, faint" This singular image we happily get rid of, finding in D's text that he fainted because his heart was hit, as it were, *manobhava bhallīyeta*, that is 'by Amor's arrow'

The enamoured youth having informed his parents of his love by the mouth of a friend, his father Guhasena went to Dharmanugupta to ask his daughter in marriage for his son. This demand is followed by a refusal, but the pretext of madness of the girl, which Dh gives in Br's text, cf 76, *kanya 'arthato me mudhā 'iti* (T „the fact is, my daughter is out of her mind') is not sufficiently in accordance with the rest of the tale. In D the father answers *kanya kuto me mudheta* [= *mudha + iti*] „I have no daughter at all fool!" In fact, Dh, after the birth of that extraordinary and heavenly being, had given out abroad that she was dead (*mṛteta khyātam bahih* cf 70)

128

Afterwards, Sourprabhā having become Guhacandra's wife on condition that she never should share his bed, the husband endeavours to excite her love by degrees, in order that he may enjoy the pleasure of a conjugal life. He feigns to prepare himself to call upon a certain hetaira and so rouses her jealousy. Looking at him askance with wrinkled brows she says

*kim jñātam etadartho 'yaṁ tejas, tatra ca mū sma gāh'*

*kim tayā? mām upēhi tvaṁ, ahaṁ hi tava gehinī*

According to Br, she speaks these words *vidāya ramena karena*, a phrase I cannot understand its translation ('zog ihn in der linken Hand herbei, I 'lifting up her veil with her left hand') is effected by hermeneutical *tour de force*. D restores the genuine text reading *nirūya* etc 'retaining him with her left hand'

- 133 A small mistake disfigures the *morale de la fable* is exposed by the great Yaṅgundhrayana. Instead of *yoga*° there is to be read with D *yagapradanadisukrtāḥ śubhakarmanum* *tīṣṭanti gihimpade*. There is here no room for *yoga*, but the good works, the reward of which are such excellent heavenly wives, consist of *sacrifices* acts of charity and the like.

18, 24 In B the splendid beauty of the royal palace is compared to that of the sea at moonrise or of a lotuspond *pravate* ('in windy weather' T). D has *prabhate* 'at daybreak', and thus Somadeva surely must have meant

46 foll In the description of the golden throne dug up for Udayana by the peasants which is a foretoken of his future domination, there are three errors in B, one of which has been corrected by T (*daśayat* for *yan*), another by Boehtlingk (*matī* for *sati* see Petr. Dict. VII, 569 s. v. *sati*). Both corrections make part of D's text moreover the first compound is there *arunāṇa mīṇavakṣanaprasāṇa*, B *grāma*°

53 King Udayana exhorted by his first minister to seat himself on the golden throne, with these words *etat kulakramayutam mahasimhasanam tayaḥ śat praptam tat samantūya devāṇāṁ kṛyatam* etc declines on account that such a high place behoves only one who has performed the *dharma*. The king's answer is made up of the 51 53 and 54. Yet the former of them has such a shape in Br, that the translator must add the former line to Yaṅgundhrayana's speech and assign only the second part of the śloka to the king. Br reads

*vijaya prthum arudha yatra te praptamahat  
tatra jita dīśah sariḥ kamam arolatah prattah*

In D however, the śloka has this fashion

*vijaya prthum arudha yatra me praptamahat  
tatra jita dīśah sariḥ ka manarolatah prattā*

= That throne which my ancestors mounted after conquering the earth, how can I gain glory by ascending



it before conquering all the regions<sup>2</sup> etc 'Thus speaking (*ity ācivān narapatiḥ*) and so on'

- 88 Āditya-sena mounts on horseback, his horse is an excellent runner „that in spirit and fury resembled a torrent”<sup>1</sup>), as T translates (Br) *varūṣam darpodghatanamṛjharām* 'This somewhat surprising image, where also *udghatana* itself is employed in a strange manner, to say nothing more, disappears in D. The horse is simply described there as *darpodya dg h a r m a mṛjharām*<sup>2</sup>), that is literally „sweating [*gharmanṛjara* = *sveda*] from (ardour and) pride'

- 136 'This śloka is a variation on the *सख्यं भद्रं च विनाशायै* Br's text disagrees here in two points with D, it has in pāda b *buddhi*, but D *irddhi*, and in pāda d two words *ubhinnam bahunāyakaṁ* that make up a compound in D. The reading of the latter is

*ivam hi daṇayattukai rddhi sthānam anāyakaṁ  
na tu viplutasanīrtham ubhinnabahunāyakaṁ*

„better, indeed, is a state without a ruler so that their prosperity merely depends on fate, than one with many discordant rulers, which entails the scattering of all their wealth” Surely, this is a sentence more suitable to the situation

- 145 Viṇḍaka has obtained the promise of the brahmins, his cohabitants, that they should recognise him as their chief and lord after he would have well performed a certain difficult enterprise 'If you do this', so they speak in T's translation, 'you shall be our lord, we make this agreement' This translation expresses their declaration otherwise than the text, which it is supposed to render 'They did not say, we make this agreement' but „we consider ourselves bound by this word, *evam hrīe tvaṁ anukam sūmi nyama eva nah* (cl 111) By itself the difference is extremely slight, but it seemed worth noticing to me because in the next śloka a word for 'agreement' being wanted, Br has *nyama* that may be = 'obligation, bond' but can never mean 'agreement' commonly expressed by *samaya*. The whole śloka in Br runs as follows

*ity eva khyāpya nyamam praplayām rajanau ca tan  
āmantrya vīrṇaṁ prajāyau śmaśānam sa Viṇḍakah*

<sup>1</sup>) T 1, 1.3 adds this note 'More literally, a torrent of pride and kicking'

<sup>2</sup>) In D's *varūṣam*, a hypothetical error

In it, besides *nyamam*, the absolute *kyappa* is grammatically incorrect. D again removes the difficulties, reading *ityevāḥ kyappa samayam* etc. cp 142 *samaye ca rayam sthātā* and 139 *samayam 20 dadumy aṭaṭ*

- 267 Princess Duḥkṛtībhīkṛtī had been given in marriage to the king of Kācchapa, but as the husband entered at night the private apartments of his newly married wife he died immediately. The same disaster occurred anew at her second wedlock and when through fear of the same fate other kings did not wish to marry her, the king gave this order to his general — You must bring a man in turn from every single house in the country so that one shall be supplied every day, and he must be a Brahman or a Kṣatriya. And after you have brought the man you must cause him to enter by night into the apartment of my daughter let us see how many will perish in this way, and how long it will go on. Whoever escapes shall afterwards become her husband. The last sentence is F's (I, 138) translation of cl 267 a, as edited in B.

*yaḥ tairiyati paścac ca so 'syā bhartu bhairiyati*  
here *paścac* (afterwards) is superfluous with the future *bhairiyati*. In D the line reads much better thus

*uttairiyati yaḥ sūtra so syā bhartu bhairiyati*  
'who survives in this (trial) shall become her husband'

- 280 Vidusikā offers herself to that dangerous adventure. While he was staying in the apartment of the princess he saw the Rikṣas that caused the death of the former bridegrooms who had perished there opening the door and stretching his hand through the entrance into the room. So according to D *apara takapatakam ayantan aṭṭala*. The reading of B *aparastakapatakam* is evidently a corruption thereof.

- 371 Br *lastagatā snehāt* I (I 113) renders this thus to him who though affliction had endured the utmost hesitating as it were, between accepting *lasti°* or *lasthū°* as the necessary correction of the unmeaning *lasti°*. From D it appears that the genuine reading is *lastāṭṭa gatā snehāt* a compound regarding not the love of Vidusikā but of Bhīṣma. At hearing this, her affection came to its highest pitch. Cp Kumārasambhava 3, 35

has *dattasammadah* 'much rejoiced', a better reading than that mentioned by T, °*sambhaviat*. At 101, 51 B has the same fault, here, too, D and two of T's MSS read °*sammadah*. As to *sammada*, cp 26, 287-46, 366

- 70 This śloka describes the impression made on the mind of the spectators by the march of the victorious army of Udayana by means of the simile that the clouds of dust raised by it concealed the brightness of the sun. This is rightly said in D *itua taccamurenur arkatejas tirodadhe*. Br's text *itua tac ca bhurenuh* etc (sic) is unmeaning

- 96 *na parai Muralinum sa seke mudhasu nonnatim*  
*larair ahanyamanesu yavat kantukucceṣv api*

So D. In Br *kanta* being severed from *kucceṣu* is considered a word by itself, which caused T to misunderstand the meaning of the whole phrase.<sup>1)</sup> There is no mention at all of tributes (*lara*) or other exaction by which the Muralis, were completely beaten down", but of their womanhood 'Not only' says the poet, 'he did not allow the Muralis to keep their heads high he abated also the elevation of their women's breasts beaten down by their own hands (in mourning over their killed relatives)'

- 107 When Udayana set out to conquer the Northern region, he marched says Somadeva to the quarter made lovely by the smile of Kubera *Kailasakusavubhayaṃ acam abhisasara sah*. In Br's text this line is preceded by the words *Kuberatilakurī ilakum angaṇamsinim* manifestly epithets of the Northern quarter. Yet *Alaka* is Kubera's city, it is not synonymous with Kubera's quarter, and how to explain *angaṇamsinim*?<sup>2)</sup> D substituting one aksara (*sa* for *ma*) dispels this perplexity. It has *tatah Kuberatilakum Alakangaṇamsinim* etc

- 20, 137 The terrible aspect of the witch Kadriti is qualified by several epithets among them *nayanamanantolka*. From D we learn that it should be °*antolka* 'casting forth flames out of her eyes and mouth'

- 219 Yugaṇḍharīyama applying to king Brahmadatta the story he has told says to Udayana

*tasmat tata sa rajendra jitepy acaratah śubham*

*Brahmadatto vikṛita yadi, hanyas tvaṃ ca tati*

So D. The apodosis in Br is *hanyeta sa 'eva tat* (sic)

<sup>1)</sup> Brockhaus himself tacitly omitted the difficult line in his translation

- 21, 60 The merchant Vasudattā bestowed so much wealth on his son-in-law, a king's son, that his pride on account of his father's splendour vanished. This is the meaning of the śloka as found in D, whose second line is

*agalaḥ bahumāno 'sya yathā śaṣṭīcārbhāve,*  
evidently preferable to B *acalaḥ* etc

- 140 „Nārada said that you should obtain a son by propitiating Īśā" (T I, 172) This is the purport of the line in B:

*Gurūārūdhraṇaṃ prāpyaputram te Nārado 'bhyadhāt*  
Here the reader tacitly corrects *Gurūārūdhraṇaprāpyam putram*, and this is found indeed in D

- 22, 39 Jimūtavāhana, having got the permission of his father Jimutaketu, besought his wishing-tree to display its wonderful power only to the benefit of others, in order that poverty should cease to be in the world. Accordingly „the wishing-tree showered much gold on the earth, and all the people rejoiced (T)”. The glory of that fact and the attachment of the people to Jimūtavāhana and his father filled the kinsmen of that prince with envy and hatred. They became hostile to Jimutaketu, „they thought it would be easy to conquer that place, which possessed the excellent wishing-tree that was employed for bestowing gifts, on account of its not being strong (T)”. If I rightly understand, the last clause must mean that they held the seat of the royal power for having lost its strength, since the wishing tree instead of serving as an instrument for upholding the reigning dynasty had been assigned to different aims. But if Somadeva intended to say so, why should he not state it explicitly? He is not accustomed to an obscure style. The fact is that B's text, which T had to follow, has here a reading hard to explain for what may be the meaning of *yuktāspadam* in *dānopayuktasatkalpavikṣayuktāṣṭadam*? D has *mukta* instead of *yukta*. So the purport of the whole śloka

*dānopayuktasatkalpavikṣamuktāṣṭadam ca tat*  
*mentre nuprabhūtatūj jetam sukaram eva ca*

becomes plain: „They thought it would be easy to conquer that (kingdom, *rājyam* in śl 37), as it had lost its strength on account of the *change of place* of the excellent wishing-tree now employed to bestowing gifts'. In śl 34 it has been narrated that the wishing-tree, at Jimutav's request,

- showered gold on the earth. In order to produce this effect it is necessary that the *kalpanika* must have lifted up itself before from the earth into heaven. That this, in fact, is presupposed by the narrator of our tale, is fully demonstrated by comparing the other redaction of the story of Jimutavahana in the Kathasaritsagara, where that withdrawal to the celestial sphere is expressly stated (pp. 90-27 foll.).
- 135 <sup>1</sup> Instead of *bhayan*, which from a grammatical point of view is unimpeachable, but is not admissible, since it is not idiomatic to use *bhayan* for *san* = 3, D has *naman*. I's translation (I 179 f) is accordingly to be corrected thus. But he, assuming heavenly garments and ornaments <bowed to me and> thus addressed me.
- 206 B: *Putale tu praveśayam na trayā mandakurīnu*, in I's translation. But you must not act so foolishly as to enter Patala. Better than *mandakurīnu* that necessitates a somewhat forced interpretation to make something not too absurd out of it is D's reading *maḍaḥurīnu*. 'You must not enter Patala pursuing your work of destruction.' So Visukī said to Girudā. Somadeva uses *maḍu* = *mardana* also 101, 362 and 105, 193.
- 23, 50 I think we do better to assume with D that Śuṣhṛṭa made his repudiated wife a *grusaiḥabhoginī* whom he recorded her livelihood and nothing more than that she became a *grusaiḥa*<sup>1</sup> (Br) in I's translation. After agreeing to that Kalyāṇakṛt one village only as her portion. Cp. the punishment inflicted by Cūṣṭhā on the two wicked high officials in Mādhavakṛt Act III (p. 135 ed. Bombay).<sup>2</sup>
- 21-22 In Br's text the sentence cannot be construed because there is no verb. D has the genuine reading *putiḥ kṛtā kareḥḥeti mātṛmātṛ kṛtātmajṛ* (Br *putiḥ kṛtātmajṛ*)<sup>3</sup>.
- 100-101 In the humorous relation of the pious conduct of the hypocrite devotee Cūṣṭhā D improves Br's text uniquely in three places. At 100 b where B has *trisaṇḍayā*, a doubtful word both from a grammatical point of view and from that of the context. D reads *bhikṣatrayā kṛtātmajṛ* *cakre trīṣṭsatyaḥ na kṛtātmajṛ*.

<sup>1</sup>) *ta* *grusaiḥabhoginī* *grusaiḥabhoginī* *grusaiḥabhoginī* *grusaiḥabhoginī* *grusaiḥabhoginī*

<sup>2</sup>) Cp. 96, 14 B (≈ 146 D) as the instance of perverted construction. Bagaṇ has the intact shape of the sentence *kṛtātmajṛ cakre trīṣṭsatyaḥ na kṛtātmajṛ*.

'he divided the begged food, three handfuls of rice, into three parts just as he broke asunder the truth'  
Cl 102 has in D this shape

*punal sa saripapuni nijam ganthyann na  
japann avaratayamasa ciram millyakamalam*

And 104 c D has *sa latimajayamasa* (Br *saripapuni*°)

25, 13 D has *tasmin suanadi lila* (not *tasmat*, as Br) a manifest correction

140 Line b of this *śloka* is 'not only defective' in Br, but is also deprived by a false reading which obscures the meaning 'a translation (I, 211) like the night adorned with the rays of the moon, now that the moon itself had set, its splendour having waned in the dark fortnight, come to worship the funeral pyre, rests on Br's *caturaya*. In D all is plain, for instead of *caturaya* ('to worship the fun pyre') it has *caturahaya* 'The wife who sits down on the earth near her empyred husband is duly compared to a night of the dark half of the month, at the time when the moon has set both in fact, are preparing to ascend the pyre that is to consume their husband the woman after the death of the tortured man and Night in the glow of the approaching dawn

*liṣṇapaksaparikṣine gate stam rajinipatan  
caturahaya tadacmiratayam ratrim uगतम*

169 I et him therefore' says the queen in I's translation (I 213) be united to him as a spring creeper to its stall. The image is bad and contrary to the use of Indian rhetoric that always compares the union of husband and wife to the creeper clinging to a tree. In fact D has here as must be expected *vrkṣenevmtam lute*, not *vinten*°, as in Br.

183 D *vilinano malamamsam grīyatam ite ghorayan* evidently the right reading, Br has *vikrānte* the present tense disturbs the structure of the phrase.

201 and 211 On both places the pronoun of the 2<sup>d</sup> person has been ousted in Br by a false reading. D has in the former place *akāśanaya bhījas te*, while the personal pronoun is indispensable, whereas Br° *bhījas tam* with an unnecessary demonstrative. In the latter one D reads *clatanniparaspaṇḍiditiyanayanam mayi*.

238 The absolute locative, that describes the dreadfulness of



for the Golden City, and now you come back alone,  
how is this? In D *pāda b* is *cinnam itas tadā*

229 B<sub>1</sub> (= 231 D) The ascetic Jalapāda, having received from Devadatta the embryo taken out of the womb of the yakṣmī Vidyutprabhā, deceived his mate and consumed the embryo alone, after sending Devadatta away under some pretext, *tat paṭayitāna garbhamaṃsam* the reading of Br. P translates, 'the great ascetic divided the child's flesh'. But it is obvious that D's reading *tat paṭayitāna garbhamaṃsam* is preferable. Jalapāda cooked the fetus in the presence of Devadatta, then he caused him to withdraw that he might enjoy the benefit of eating that disunal food alone and immediately.

233 B<sub>1</sub> (= 235 D) Devadatta lamenting over the foul trick of Jalapāda says among other things, 'to whom does not excessive complaisance entail misfortune?' The Sanskrit original, here translated, is

*yadā vatyantamūduta na kasya paribhūṭaye?*

To say nothing of the point, whether *mūduta* 'softness mildness' may be the equivalent of 'complaisance', the reading of D

*yadā vatyantam ūṇuta na kasya paribhūṭaye*

is doubtless to be preferred. It is not 'excessive complaisance' but 'excessive uprightness' that makes an honest man the dupe of scoundrels.

259 B<sub>1</sub> (= 261 D) In B<sub>1</sub> the simile has been made incomprehensible by a bad reading *akṛṣṭaḥ satataḥ* cannot be right even if *satataḥ* is considered to be erroneously put for *satataḥ*. D has here

*akṛṣṭaḥ sattvataḥ Siddheḥ keṣapūṣa vāyataḥ*

The embryo drawn out by its neck is compared to the long ban of fortune seized by the grasp of courage (*sattvataḥ*)

279 B<sub>1</sub> (= 281 D) After Cakṛtīdeva has become finally a vidyadhara and has recovered his four wives in the Golden City his father-in-law the king of the vidyadhara, bestows on him his kingdom. And before abdicating the old king performs also something else. What this is, is not plain from the text of Br., where the second half of this mīmāṃsā strophe has this shape

*apī ca kṛtinam enant Cakṛtīdevaṁ śānamna*

*vidyadhara samuditeṇa śreṇa vidyadhareṇa*

T translates this and he gave the successful hero his



name by which he was henceforth known among his Vidyādharas. The fact seems as strange as the Sanskrit expression of it (*Çaktidevam śanāmṇā vyadhita*). D's text makes the matter sufficiently clear

*api ca kṛtinam enam Çaktivegam śanāmṇā  
vyadhita samuvecitena śreṣṭha vidyādhareṣu,*

that is he (the old king) changed the name of his son-in-law a little by transforming (its latter part) *deva* into *vega*, a common name with his vidyādharas. Names ending in *vega* are frequent among that lofty people. So Madanavega in tr 30 and foll., Mānasavega 34, 106 etc., Padmavega 64, 62 (ib 58 B). *Padmavega* by mistake, D has *Padmavega*), another Madanavega 87, 7.

27, 146 In Amaragupta's praise of hunting as an appropriate and useful pastime of kings, T translates Br's text „hunting is approved to give them exercise and excitement, but unlike expeditions are not recommended" (I, 243). The strange second part of this sentence ought to be thus corrected „for kings who have not exercised themselves in the way of fighting are disapproved" according to D *yuddhādhvani na çaṣyante rājāno hy akṣaṭaśramāḥ*

185 Bī *paravat sadu*, D *paravatmanā*. For any one who reads the whole story of Karabhaka it must be plain that it is D that exhibits the good reading. The woman whom K has rescued so that she prefers him to her coward of a husband, prompts him to follow her but „by another way" than that taken by her husband and his company, of course. T (I, 245) has endeavoured to elicit some apposite meaning from Bī's *paravat sadu* („though I passed for some one unconnected with her"), but that translation not only omits *sadu*, but its content is less appropriate to the course of the tale.

196 Bī *latrāntah sthitayoḥ nau ca, madhyahne tām tadava sām*  
*mitram me bhratrjyāyās tasyā iva eṣam [= eṣam] akūrayat*  
The beginning of this śloka is to be accepted, according to the interpunction, as an absolute locative, but what has the awkward mentioning of midday time in parenthesis to do here? *Madhyahne* is corrupt. D reads *madhyāhṇe tam tadava sām*. In fact not the absolute locative is here wanted, but *sthitayoḥ nau ca* are two genitives to be construed with *madhyāhṇe* and either significative of two couples, „as the two women and we two [the two brahmins] stayed

there or the meaning is as we two also stayed there  
 28 65 The singular conduct of the yaksinis the friends of  
 the *apsaras* Rambhā who in order to benefit the king  
 her lover, fill up his land with heaps of gold by trans-  
 forming themselves into trees (I I 250), seems to be  
 due to a misreading *uṣṭan* B took it for *uṣṭair* The  
 yaksinis poured down the gold as rain from heaven a  
 well known Indian rhetorical image

29 62 In B this *śloka* is thus edited  
*ajayambhayanibhūtam tam agraṣṭa* (sic) *Śayambhā*  
*Śayambhā* takes her leave from Somprabha This is  
 however, impossible since it is she who had called upon  
*Śayambhā*, with her friend Kalinasenī In fact it is  
*Kalinasenī*, who takes leave as is plain from D  
*ajayambhayanibhūtam tam aprastā Śayambhām*  
*Kalinasenam aropya yanti* etc

I have connected the two parts of the *bhūvān* which  
 closes the first line in D they are by mistake separated  
 (cp *supra* p 92) Cp also *supra* p 88

150 Kūtisenī having overheard the conversation of the  
*Rakṣasī* and her children about King Viśudatta's disease  
 and the means to cure it reflects that she may avail  
 herself of that knowledge and save the life of that king  
 who deserves it for he takes but small duties from  
 the merchants In B this deliberation is made obscure  
 by a fault in cl 150 *etum ei dātā* so *lpaśulkaḥ prān-*  
*asthito rakṣ* the *acc* has no verb to rely upon and  
*balī* after *prānasthita* is a tautology Better D  
*etum ei dātāim so lpaśulkaḥ prānasthito vati*  
 = by the small duties he takes he is a bliss for this  
 forest region

31 3 Kalinasenā tells her friend Somprabha that her father  
 wishes to give her in marriage to Prasajyot who is an  
 old man but Udayan so she says, the king of Vatsa  
 is young and handsome you have told me, so first  
 shew me Pras; and then take me there where the king  
 of Vatsa is' (I I, 276) In the original text *kāṭṭhaye*  
 denotes the hermitic retreat I's rendering by in the  
 course of conversation cannot be approved of D makes  
 the *śloka* intelligible, which runs thus

*I taseṣāṃ tu yathā rupe dayana kātṭhas tātṭh-*  
*eyam āgacchati tena I tātṭha tena yathā vā vati*;

„but you have described the beauty of the king of Vatsa in such a way that —.”

27 and 29 D restores the true reading of two ślokas, which are obscure in B's text. Citrālekṣhā has delivered to Amruddha the love-message of Uṣā, and having excited thereby his eagerness to see Uṣā, she takes him up to her, „looking exactly as he had before appeared in Uṣā's dream”, as T (I, 277) endeavoured to render B's text.

*ādāya cātātadrūpam śapṇāvatāra eva lam*,  
yet it is plain that neither of the two compounds *ātātadrūpam* and *śapṇāvatāre* properly convey the meaning given to them in the translation. D has *ādāya cātātadrūpasvapnavrttāntam eva lam* = „took him, having made him know the story of her dream, just as it was” — Her joy when beholding him is thus described apud T 11 „When Uṣā beheld that Amr arrived in bodily form, resembling the moon, there was a movement in her limbs resembling the tide of the sea”, a note at the bottom of the page informs the reader that *velāta* is evidently corrupt. So indeed it is. Instead of वेलाता D has वेलाना

The śloka is very plain in D, where it runs thus

*sā dr̥ṣṭvā Amruddham tam Uṣā sakṣud upāgatam  
amrtāṃṣum nambodhivelā nangeṣv aśartata*

= „when U beheld A arrived in bodily form, her limbs could not contain the emotion within her, as little as the seetide can do so under the influence of the moon”. Accordingly the hypothetical expedient of Bohtlingk (PW VI, 1375, s. v. *velā*) falls away. The expression *nāngeṣv aśartata* to signify an exuberant sudden joy is well-known. A variation of it occurs t 110, 112 *Kalūṅgusena tam dr̥ṣṭvā gamūtarām atthamajam / tralokyē 'pi na mūti sma sveṣv augeṣu tu kā kathā* (cp also *supra*, p. 66)

35 D *ānayat param* better than B *ānayet param*. T's translation 'might take up a strange man' is not wholly inconsistent, but the imperfect tense does better.

32, 56 Br = 55 D is a general sentence, incorporated by Bohtlingk in his „Indische Sprüche”, who translates it thus „Wenn ein Weiser unter vielen Toren gerath, so ist er sicher verloren, wie eine Was-erro-ge, die auf den Pfad der Wellen gerath”. This „Pfad der Wellen” answers to *pathas tarauṅgām* of the text of Br 'T', who rests on

the same text, has likewise „A single wise man fallen among many fools, like a lotus in the path of the waves, is sorely overwhelmed” But it is not in the habit of Sanskrit rhetoric to employ comparisons of such an odd character, and further the plural *patthas* cannot be accounted for How much better the *gloka* appears in D

*eko bahūnām murkhūnām madhye nīpatito budhah*

*padmah pāthas tarangūnām na vipālate dhīman*

So we get a well elaborated simile and, at the same time, a pun The one wise man fallen among many fools is like a lotus fallen on the waves Either of them *vipālate*, the wise man because he comes into distress, the lotus inasmuch as it floats about on the back of the waves *Pāthas* = ‘water’ is quoted in the Petr Dict from our author twice, 27, 122 and 73, 194, it is also met with 102, 54 and 103, 57

67 B<sub>1</sub> = 86 D is thus rendered „Whom will not a wicked woman kill, when won over by another man, like a sword in an enemy’s hand, since enticed by love she commits reckless crime without being taught” (P I, 255) The last three words look rather odd in this connection Yet T rendered faithfully B<sub>1</sub>’s reading *aśikṣitā*, D has *aśankitā* „without any scruple’, doubtless right

35, 58 A misreading of what he found in his mss, is the cause, it seems of *kanthakath* put by Brockhaus for *kandukath* By the vicious reading the pun is lost D has  
‘*utpatadbhīḥ patadbhīḥ ca hanyamānāḥ śrapunna*

*cīram mrgaiḥ ca samhaiḥ ca kṛdita kandukair na*

‘The king killing in the sport of the chase antelope and lions makes the impression as if he played with balls, *utpatati* denotes the ‘rising up’ of the wounded or hunted deer and at the same time the ‘jumping’ of the ball, both *patanti*, the animals, when hit and unable to arise from the ground, the balls, when coming down

37, 85 The elegance of the expression is enhanced, if we read with D *rāgīn śrīcīttam etadrk*, where *rāgīn* is a vocative Br has *rāgīścīttam*

38, 28 The heteria Mularmūlā conjectures that the Rūput who visits her must be a person of high condition for the reason given in this *gloka*, which has in Br this form

*sā tam kakshyāsa sākūta-nirānta hayūdīkam*

*śrutā parīyanūd, matā pracchannam kameid uttamam,*



defies interpretation, cp T's note on I 370 Every difficulty disappears in D, which has

*iyam śaśavarasanecccha iyomni vā citralalpanā  
anahsaro hṛinyaso yad vidyādhyayanam vina*

This śloka is found with the self-same words in Kṣemendra's *Bīṭhāthūmaṅgarī*, XIV, 342 (p 196 of the printed edition) For the rest cp Bhūtrharī Nītiś stanza 4

34 The words with which Marubhūti, that drunk and quarrelsome fellow, addresses Gomukha convey a convenient meaning in D, which in B has been lost owing to bad readings T (I, 371) translates „There is power in the speech of G, but there is no might in the arms of men like you A garrulous, quarrelsome, effeminate person makes heroes blush” This is a good rendering of B

*balam Gomukha vācy eva, na tu bāhvor bhavadīṇām,  
vācālak kalahā kṛivas trapākṛd bāhuśālīnām,*

but it has a strange purport A miles gloriosus, like Marubhūti, never would avow that a garrulous poltroon, as he takes Gomukha, should make him blush! In D the pīṭh c is *vācālak kalahā kṛibak* Adopting this reading and dissolving Br's compound *Gomukhavacy* into two separate words we get the genuine form of our śloka

*balam Gomukha vacy eva na tu bāhvor bhavadīṇām  
vācālak kalahā kṛibak trapākṛd bāhuśālīnām*

„Men like you, G, have only strength in their tongue, not in their arms It is blameworthy for heroes to quarrel with effeminate braggarts”

13 54

The physician to whom the old king Vilāṣī applies to make him young again is a cunning fellow he promises to fulfil his wish, but only under this condition that the king shall remain for eight months in an underground room alone The ministers, who do not trust the matter, dissuade the king In days of old, they say, there existed herbs etc which had the power of rejuvenating, but nowadays such a thing is impossible” The argument with which they assert that opinion is vitiated in Br by several corruptions D restores its true form, as follows

*adyatve ca śrutany eva rasāny etan bhīpate  
sūmagryabhūāt kuriantī yat pratyuta uparyayam 53  
tan na yuktaṁ idam, dhurtuk kṛidantī eva hi bahiṣak  
kim deṁ samatīkrāntam agacchati punar iayah 54*

"But in the present time, O king, these elvirs<sup>1)</sup> are only heard of [= they do not exist in reality], and owing to the want of proper materials, produce the opposite effect to that which is intended. For this reason, it is not fit [to do] so [as the physician advises], for rogues do in this way make sport with fools, etc. I have italicized the phrases, which correct T's translation, the rest is given with his own words

- 81 The cunning physician having succeeded in persuading the king to shut up himself in a subterranean abode, made king in his place a young man, named Ajara. But king Ajara shows little gratefulness to the physician, though he honours him and avoids to take his advice about state affairs. The physician in his uneasiness once reminds Ajara that it was he who made him king, whereupon the other answers, 'you are wrong it is not you but my *pruktanam kaima* that gave me this royal power'. At these words the physician is perplexed and reflects in this manner as I literally quote from T's translation (I 374) "This man is not to be intimidated and speaks like a resolute sage. It is better to overawe that master *the secret of whose character is instability*, but that cannot be done with this man so I must submit to him." I do not understand the purport of the words I have italicized which seem to be the endeavour to a faithful translation of Br's *yad rahasyam tarangatam*, a clause rather unmeaning in my opinion. Here too D removes the difficulty. The śloka is edited there in this shape

*yad rahasyantarangatam si musamananam param  
tad api kramate nuzminn amantya tad esa me*

Its purport is quite different. Even the most excellent means to gain one's master's favour the possessing a secret in common is useless with this man so I must submit to him."

- 42, 166 D *tad gṛhaia tvaṁ evatatkādagam nistṛiṅgakarīṅkoma  
atyaktajātudharmam māu etenava nyataya*  
(cp T I, 357, 2) "so take thou his word etc.", manifestly a correction of Br's text, where *nistṛiṅgakarīṅkoma* is quite unmeaning

<sup>1)</sup> Perhaps we should correct *rajaḥ* to *raja* T's MS has *raja* (see his note at I 372)

- 43, 248 This gīti stanza in Br is troublesome, the words  
*ibhūsitam sudaṣṭīhakūlena jaladhīm* cannot be understood  
 'I was at a loss how to translate them, see his note on  
 I, 402 All becomes plain in D

*sarīe ca <te> ibhūsitā Sudaṣṭīhakūlena jaladhīm ākrāmya  
 samupākṛītām svapatinā vyaktam sodaryamārtim amṛtasya  
 ajarūṅganāṣṭatayutam āyatām Śrīyam vābhyānandans tām,*

= „and they all welcomed her (viz Karpurikā) arrived  
 with her husband (Naravāhaṇadatta), the ornament of  
 the illustrious family of the Daṣṭīhas, who had brought  
 her over sea, as a manifestation of the very sister  
 of the *amṛta*, yea as if she were Śrī accompanied  
 with a hundred of over young nymphs” The right  
 acceptation of the epithet *ibhūsitā*<sup>o</sup> is secured by the  
 comparison of 107, 46, cp PWK VII, 147 s. v  
*sudaṣṭīhakula* ‘Though Naravāhaṇadatta is a descen-  
 dant of Arjuna, not of Kṛṣṇa — see our author 9,  
 6 — he is reckoned to belong to the family of the  
 Daṣṭīhas

- 259 Bī *vinīta-gaganāṅgatāgamana-khedah* is rendered by ‘I  
 (I, 403) „Naravāhaṇadatta], having made his party of  
 anti-tivellers forget the fatigues of the journey” The  
 inelegant agglutination *āṅgatāgamana* disappears in D,  
 where the compound has this shape *vinītagaganāṅgaṇā  
 gamanakhedah* As to *gaganāṅgana* = the wide firmament  
 the sky’ cp Aptis Dictionary s. v. *angana*

- 261 Instead of Bī *bhukṭā ’uttaram* which is no Sanskrit  
 at all, to convey the meaning required here immediately  
 after (he) had taken food (T I, 103), D has *bhukto  
 ttaram*, as usual Cp 14, 107 73 15 114 51 121,  
 2 123, 52 It is only in the last three places that Br  
 has edited the word as it ought to be 11, 107 we  
 find again *bhukṭā ’uttaram* and 73, 15 even *bhuktetaram*  
 Cp also Kṣemendra (p 329) IX, 2, 519 (p 512)  
 XVI, 17

- 11, 65 *etat kṛtū* (Bī) is a mere slip of the pen, it seems,  
 for *etac chrutū* (D), which is required

- 108 Prabhāsa relates to his master his conversation with  
 the king of Śukrantha In Br his relation begins with  
 this half-śloka

*deva Śukrantharāya prabham samgatavim alam*  
 where the acc *prabham* is a syntactical mon-strum, the



msinum being wanted. It is plain that D's text, where that line runs thus

*deva Āṛikanthasaye prabhī aman gataṁ aham*,  
has the right reading, and it is highly probable that Brockhaus has misunderstood his ms., *prabhum sangata°* and *prabhraman gata°* may be very like to each other in the ms. he had at his disposal. T's translation (I, 410) must accordingly be thus modified „King, in the course of my wandering I arrived in the country of Āṛikantha”

- 133 When king Janamejaya of Kanṣāmbī performs the marriage ceremony of his daughter with prince Śūnyaprabha, Br's text contains the memorable fact that „he made such a feast, that even the realm of Pluto was exclusively engaged in music and dancing” (T I, 411)

*calre ca rūdya-nṛttaika-yama-lokam mahotsavam*  
What, may be asked, had king Yama to meddle there-with? Nothing at all, indeed. In D he disappears with his realm, it is there simply said, that „he made a great festival to his guests, which entirely consisted of music and dancing” = *calre ca rūdyanṛttaikamayam lokam mahotsavam*

- 176 D = 177 Br has *loshtham* instead of *kottam* (D). The same error (in Br) and correction (of D) 49, 68

- 186 D = 187 Br is thus translated by T (I, 414) „Then Śākala, inhabited by that fortunate one, appeared glorious, as if the chiefs of the gods, of the followers of Kubera, and of the snakes had made in it many deposits of much wealth” If, however, we read with D in pāda c *śūa-Dhanada-bhujaga-nagarath* (instead of *°bhujanga varath*), this *āryā* stanza will contain a more convenient meaning „appeared, by its great wealth and heavy treasures, as if it were made up of the cities of the Gods, of Kubera, and of the Snakes, put together” In pāda b (D) *bhoginū* is preferable to (Br) *bhāginū*

- 45, 183 Prince Sun-hine (Sūryaprabha) is described lying alone, without any of his many wives, on his couch sleepless. The reason of his sleeplessness, says the poet, was that Sleep (*Nidrā*) herself was angry at him „saying to herself, ‘what is the use of this unloving man, who leaves his wives outside?’” (T I, 123) The original in Br is „*nīśanchena kum etāna śa-pṛayās tyajatā lakṣh*”

*iti va nidrā stri nityasya cakrasya asya na āyayan*  
 Here the compound *nidrā-stri* is suspicious, I translates it 'the goddess of sleep' but *nidra*, being a feminine noun does not want the addition of *stri* for the sake of personification and *nityasya* in connection with the words following must imply the meaning that Surya prabha slept alone habitually yet he did so that night exceptionally. Much better is the reading of the second line in D

*itva nidra strimtyasya 1 asyāpy asya nayayan*  
 with this appropriate meaning. The Sleep deity (*Nidra*) thus (considering) did not come to him who was in the habit of female company though he was alone

207 D confirms the correction made by I on account of his MS and moreover restores in pāda c the true reading *tava paśyatu caru pi* (viz *ripam*) See F's note on I, 124

16 28 B has here *drīta* instead of *dītya* (D) a not infrequent clerical error

52 foll The two rival hosts of the Āsuras who favour Surya prabha and of the Vidyadhars the followers of Ārta carman are to meet together at the place named Valmika in order to witness the appearance of a sign of future domination. The *lakṣana* of the future Cakravartin over the realm of the Vidyadhars will there be visible. What that sign shall be is not expressed in Br's text. In the sequel (vs 62—85) it is narrated that this sign shows itself a quiver appearing at first in the shape of a serpent. Neither Ārta carman nor any of his men was able to lay hold of it but Suryaprabha seized it and in that very moment it changed into a priceless quiver. Now D names the quiver already in vs 52 it has in pāda c *tunam* instead of *turnam* (Br). And in 53 it reads *sanyasamudhina* whereas Br has *sanyas samudhina*. Both variants are real emendations as clearly appears if we transcribe the two ślokas in full and modify I's translation accordingly

*tasya mī colpadgate tatra lakṣanā cakravartinat*  
*tunam Vidyadhara gantvā tatkrte cakra tva titlva* (52)  
*evam Sumeraṇa prokte sanyasasamudhina dinam*  
*miti pratar yayis tat te Valmikaḥ sabalā ratnāt* (53)

(I 1 136) And on that day there is produced there a sign to shew the future emperor a *quiver* and for that reason

the Vidyādhāras are going there that day (I, 437) After Sumeru *had spoken thus*, they spent that day *with the arrangement of the army*, and went on the morrow to Valmīka in chariots with their army " I have italicized my modifications As to *samudhā*, cp 113, S

- 159 Br *yó ca 'agamyā hrīā jñāteḥ Sunītha tanaya trayā*  
The singular *jñāteḥ* is change to express „your carrying off from her relations”, as T (I, 441) necessarily translates, the connection of the title excludes here the mention of but one relative Better is D *hrīājñāte* = ‘carried off stealthily [= *hrīa* + *ajñāte*]’

- 47, 97 The trifling absence of one vowel sign has perverted the meaning of the second line of this śloka in Br A great and undecisive battle has taken place The night has put an end to it The wives of Suryaprabha who have to deplore the loss of relatives fallen in that battle meet together in the night to console each other „But even on that melancholy occasion [*śudhitasare*] they indulged in miscellaneous conversation ’ For, as the poet adds with a gnomic turn (Br)

*śrīnum na ca kṣano yatra na kathasv aparāśrayāḥ*

It is not easy to understand the last word *Parāśraya* and its negation *aparāśraya* whether taken as a tatpuruṣa or as a bahuvrīhi seem to be out of place here, nor will *apara* (= other) + *śraya* (resting place, support) be of use T, translating the line thus ‘there is no occasion on which women are not irrelevant in their talk’ (I, 451), has analysed the compound, it seems, in this way *a* + *para* (high[est]) + *śraya* = ‘resting on [i.e. treating of] not high [= irrelevant] (matter)’ But this interpretation is forced The reading of D satisfies better and gives to the saying of Somadeva its very point D has

*śrīnum na ca kṣano yatra na katha svapurāśraya*,  
the meaning of which is, I think, „there is no occasion on which women would not talk of the *chronique scandaleuse* of their town’

- 114 It is clear that D *prasūdhanojjvala* is preferable to Br *prasūdhena 'ujjvalā*

- 19, 24 Br *darśayāmāsa sac castrā vidyā apā ca tatkrāmāt*  
That this verse introduces the episode of Guṇaśarman, the gifted minister, displaying his skill at arms, appears

from the sequel For this reason there can be no doubt that D is right reading instead of *sacchāstravidyā* — a strange turn to express 'skill in the noble studies' (T I, 460) — *śastrāśtravidyā* = „his skill in handling both kind of weapons, for striking and throwing” Similarly at çl 5 D has the good reading *kalāśastrāśtravid*, where B<sub>1</sub> reads *kalāśāstrāśtravid*

102 foll

I cannot account for *loranibandhādi* in vs 102, the reading of both D and B<sub>1</sub>, but there can be no doubt as to the import of this word, whether it be corrupted or uncorrupted But the following ślokas (103—108) which are quite obscure in B<sub>1</sub>, recover their proper meaning in D T did not know how to translate them well and adopted B<sub>1</sub>'s conjecture that there must be a gap after 101, cp the note of Brockhaus on p 235 of his edition of „Buch VI, VII, VIII” (Leipzig, 1862) From D it appears, however, that nothing is wanting I write out its text

- tam ca koranibandhādi Gaudam kārayatum nrpam*  
 (103) *visasarya sa dutam śram guptam āptam devyudhamah*  
*tam dr̥ṣṭu tatva sudas tam āpto rajanam abhyadhāt*  
 (104) *aham te sudhavyayit etat karayam, mūrthakārayam kṛthāh*  
*ity ukṣtu bandhayitu tam sa dutam Guṇaśarmanah*  
 (105) *sudo martiastutim rakṣam chāgūd vidaduyakah*  
*tamadye ca pulayana tato nigṛhya bandhanat*  
 (106) *Guṇaśarmāntikam dutas tadīyah so bhīṣṇapaganat*  
*tenādhyatavittuntenolva sarīram sa darīṣatah*  
 (107) *sudo mahānase 'smakam praviṣto Guṇaśarmane<sup>1)</sup>*  
*tato jnatvā sa dhūrtena supakṛt bṛahma-bandhūna*  
 (108) *vidadanodyatas tena tabhgam acedya ghatitah*

The few corrections in D are important enough to substitute a clear and consistent account for the confused and obscure facts, involved in B<sub>1</sub> and to dispel the difficulty mentioned by Brockhaus 11 „noch fehlt ein Moment in der Erzählung, etc” It is in çl 104, not 105, that the cook of the Gauda king is spoken of at the first time Queen Aśokavatī, in her anger against the faithful minister Guṇaśarma who had declined her propositions of love, makes a false report of him to king Mahāseṇa, her husband, telling him this invented story

<sup>1)</sup> So already I proposed by conjecture in 2, çl 1 in note 2 on 2, 461

of herself Guṇaṣarman had despatched one of his servants as a messenger to the Gauda king to make a bargain for the sake of treason. Thereupon the cook of the Gauda counselled his lord to commit to himself the work of killing Mahāśena by poison, so he might reach his aim without loss of money (*mārthakṣayam kṛthāh* 104). The cook then, after persuading his master and making him cast into prison Guṇaṣarman's messenger, that the secret could not transpire (*mantrasrutim rakṣan* 105), set out for Ujjayinī to perform his purpose. In the meanwhile the messenger made his escape from prison, succeeded in coming back to Guṇaṣarman and told him that which had happened. Thus informed G., realizing that he could make no profit by the murder of Mahāśena, his master, overtook the cook in the royal kitchen, in which he had entered already and „denounced him and so had him put to death”

The only difficulty that remains is in the first pāda of 106. If the text is genuine, it is 1<sup>ly</sup>, said that the messenger *ran away and made his escape* or even more literally, *made his escape from prison after running away* and 2<sup>ly</sup> *tanmadhye* = „in the meanwhile”. Both statements are improbable: the former implies an awkward mode of expression and a *π-εφεσ* - *εφεσ* opposite to the habits of Sanskrit composition, as to the latter, *tanmadhye* is not synonymous with *atransare* and cannot have another meaning but „in the midst (amid) of it (them)”

I propose to correct the evident corruption by conjecture

*tad i akṣacupaḷyenaua tato nigatya bandhanāt*  
= „afterwards (*tatah*), having made his escape from prison in consequence of the negligence of his gaoler(s)”

This correction restores the sense and is not inconsistent with the palaeographical account of the origin of the deprivation of the text

120 D = 121 Br „For in the beginning wicked women sprang from lying Speech”. So T (I, 464) translates the line which in B runs thus

*śūdrā avatyavacanāt pāpā jātā hi kṣtriyāḥ*

The double designation of the wicked women by *pāpāḥ* and by *kṣ- trīyāḥ* is suspect the genuineness of the transmitted words. D, indeed, has this different wording

*śūdrā avatyavacanān paścā jātā hi kṣtriyāḥ*

= For in the beginning Lying Speech was born thereafter wicked women

227—229 D = 229—231 B1 In four places of these three ślokaś D's text greatly improves both the style and the sense. It has (227) *svikṣaṇ* and *vañchasy* [as I already proposed I 470 n 1] instead of *śayam* and *vañchasy* (Br) (228) *tadeśa* for *na dośho* (B1) 231, where B1 more *solito* has left out a full word [cp *supra*, p 65] it fills up the gap reading *tiṣṭha < jnato > yatlecchasi*. Accordingly T's translation (I 470) is to be modified in such a manner as I indicate by italicizing my corrections. And as for your *striving for happiness by abandoning* the body in this also you are led astray for in the next world suicides suffer more severe pains than here. *Therefore this folly is* unbecoming to one so young and wise *as you are* decide for yourself you must certainly do what I tell you. I will have made for you here a spacious and beautiful subterranean dwelling many *Sundrā* and live at ease in it *unknown*.

50 1 I has very well seen that *Caśapa* api (B1) cannot be right. The wild *Çabaras* have nothing to do in this battle of *Asuras* and *Vidyādharas*. He was also right in supposing that the arrows are meant not the wild forest tribes. D reads the *pada* *yadyanti śīva caśapa* api even the arrows (shot by the two hosts) fought with each other.

54 *Brahma* counselling *Indra* to make peace with his foes ends his speech with the words rendered by I (I 174) thus. These are now favoured by Śiva as it is not now a time of victory for you make peace with your foes. The original concluding line is in Br

*tad na ayam jaya kīlō'at sandhni kuruta vīgrahat*  
I do not think I intended to make a literal rendering of the last word which is here quite unmeaning for neither with wars nor with bodies — what other meaning can *vīgrahat* purport? — is consistent with the context. Now D once more restores the sense. It has *sandhni kuruta kīlō'at grahāt* = make peace what is the use of fighting? This meaning of *grah* is registered in PW s v II c 3 *Kumpfanstreuung* = *रणमिश्र* but only testified to from dictionaries, cp

also PWK, II, s v. II, c, 9, where the sphere of this signification is extended

D 157 = Br 155 Here, too, D's text is decidedly preferable

*tatvatum ca ghaṇṇeśaśaḍaśanacchadaḥkhandanaiḥ*

*tyūjayitva śaṇaṇ laj्जām navodhūśulabhām tatuh*

Br has *cumbanāḥlesha°* and *tyūjayitvā śaṇanāḥ kāntām navodhūm so°* And in 158 (D) = 159 (Br) we read *ratam anasūditam anyābhyah*, for *anāsūditam*

52, 185 T (I, 503 in *pro*) „Then Jivadatta rose up delighted and praised Dmḡī” Here B has *antāmbikah* If it had been possible that T knew the reading *natāmbikah* (so D), he would have preferred it, I think, and translated „— and bowed to Dmḡā” which is more adapted to the situation Moreover the use of *nata-* in this very connection, though unrepachable by itself, seems somewhat uncommon

54, 60 T (I, 525) „After remaining there for four days thus occupied” = *etam sthitaḥ atra caturo diśāśn* (Br.) D has a more elegant turn *etam sthitaḥ tīratatvān diśāśn* „— for three or four days”

235 The second part of this śloka is a sententious saying of the poet on the occasion of the capture of some queen by the king after vanquishing her husband and making him a prisoner Her he put into his zenana and she underwent that change of husbands rather willingly, for, says Somadeva,

*kumamohapratīttānām cabalā dharmamāsau*

So D, Br has *capala*, not *cabalā* I think, D is right, and translate the sentence in a manner somewhat different from T (I, 536) „in those who act up to their desires (kāma) or their delusion (moha) the impressions of virtue (dharma) are impure [properly variegated, spotted, viz. have lost their white, pure colour]”.

239 D *etam bahū apītipuṇābhakṣajavarttān* *jayati* is doubtless better than Br *samarapīvarttān*, that it is a victory ‘in the front of battle’ is expressed by *saṃyugamūrdhva* in pīḍa *d* and is not in need of another tautological expression

241 In Br *nūḍya saṃgitarasāgatām tatvā/nūḍm sa gūḍan śayam nūḍanāsukhaḥ* etc the second word is difficult to analyse without hurting either the grammar or the sense T's (I, 537) translation, therefore, is philologically speaking,

insufficient, *samgitarasagata* *nu* is not adequate to a night, which was devoted to the amusement of a concert. D has, indeed, a different reading *unaya samgitarasaca tam* etc. as he was fond of music, he spent that night etc.

55, 9

Erroneous division of one word into two — *mūḥa bhavaḥ* instead of *murkhabhavaḥ* — impairs the understanding of Nārāyaṇadāsa's reproach of Māribhūti that he has answered with a joke the claim of his servant, whose wages he had not paid. Translation of this line (I, 537) 'what are you thinking about, you fool? Your intentions are not over creditable' depends on Br. In D the line has this form

*Am eam murkhabhavas te nadlikeyam matas tara*  
I take both sentences for interrogations and translate thus 'Is your stupidity (still) such? Does your wit not exceed it?'.

27

I rendering this clause into English, subjoins in a note (I, 538) the puns here deft translation. The poet uses here the rhetorical figure named *parisamkhyā*. In Br it encompasses three links but in D there are four. It is obvious that D's reading

*yatra bandhaḥ karuṇam chedak pātreṣu adhyata  
bhango lakṣu nṛṣuṃ saṃsāraṃ grahaṇe klāṣaḥ*

is preferable to that of Br (*satu* instead of *chedak*).

67

And then she made me paint a very handsome youth slowly tracing out the form on the ground with nectar, nectar distilling hand to guide me (I I, 540). What is a *nectar distilling hand* that traces a form on the ground? This is hard to understand from D. It appears that (Br) *parṇam amṛta caritām* is a false reading. In D the line runs thus

*ity alṭa repaṇaṇa pṛṇa dṛṣṭa caritām*

It is not a nectar distilling but a pencil holding hand that traces the figure of the young man.

79

Rohidevi, having excited the curiosity of king Kṛṣṇa about the princess whose likeness he has painted, is summoned to show the picture. He obeys and

*tato calgulikūṭasthām dṛṣṭvā patāni adarṇayāt  
sa citrakṛt tam citrasthām rajo Madanasundarīm*

So Br 'The painter accordingly showed the king Madanasundarī in a painting' (I I, 540) but the preparatory



action is here rather obscure. Its translation, 'Then the printer looked out a piece of canvas which was in a bag endeavours to make the best of it. Especially *dr̥ṣṭva* is strange in this connection where one expects to read that Rāḍadeva drew the printing out of the bag. Yet D has this very sense reading

*tato valgulikatas tam kṛstva paṭam adarṣayat*

Then the printer drew the piece of canvas from the bag etc

- 175 Kāṇḍakavira enters the temple of Kumāra, which bears the epithet of 'sanctifying temple' (F I, 545) in Br (*śvecā gaṛbhābhavanam tasya devasya pavakam*). For the last word D has *pavakeḥ*. Pavaka is an epithet of Kumāra = Skandā Kuttikeya

- 216 T's translation (I 547) of the account how the king escaped the assault of the furious elephant is right as far as it expresses that which ought to be said in Br

When the king saw that he fled by a way full of holes etc. is not an adequate rendering of *tam dr̥ṣṭvā cābhra margena sa rāja upasarat talā*. D, once more presents the right reading *rajapasarat talā*

- 234 Kāṇḍakavira has regained his wife and returns home, passing by the possessions of his father-in-law king Devaśakti. How then is it likely that Somadeva related his arrival at the residence of Devaśakti, in the way as is related upad T (I 515). And in a few days he reached the residence of his father-in-law a hermitage in the country of Vīdarbhā and after that his wealthy city of Kāṇḍina.<sup>22</sup> A reigning king does not keep his residence in a *hermitage*. From D it appears that it is not Somadeva but some copyist's error that brought in the word *aśṭamam*, as is edited in Br. D has *acrita*. Here is the whole pṛthivī stanza in its corrected shape

*atīpa ca sa rajasarat katipayair gr̥hā : cāciraṇ  
Vīdarbhācārajastat tad atla Kāṇḍina śhlyan puran |  
saurddhīmatī talā ca śāurasāṅkṛtā kancī  
dīnany abhijata śhīlā tanagadīrasenagatā ||*

Therefore he did not come at first to a hermitage in Vīdarbhā and afterwards to Kāṇḍina but it is narrated that he reached Kāṇḍina the capital of his father-in-law situated in Vīdarbhā and stayed there for some days

56, 78—80 B<sub>1</sub> supposes here a gap of two lines (79 b, 80 a in his edition), probably he was induced to do so by the beginning of 80 b *iti mrbandhapista ca* But there is nothing wanting D reads *atimrbandhapistā ca* When the Mothers asked her the first time, she laughed without giving reason of her laughing (*sa jahasa tu nahavit*) But on their strong instances she told it them

57, 12 In the story of the porter who found king Udayana's bracelet and sold one jewel out of it, a slight correction in the text and accordingly in B's translation (II, 2) is to be obtained from D, where the śloka 12 is thus edited

*etac chintita sa Valseṣas tatianayayati sma tau*

*bharikam tam savatayam saratnam vanyam cu tam*  
Udayana summoned the porter to come with the bracelet and the merchant with the jewel B<sub>1</sub> has *sarvanayam sadratnavanyam* Likewise śl 9 D corrects the vicious reading of B<sub>1</sub> *sadratnakatakam*, reading *saratnam katakam* a bracelet beset with jewels

16 Though the lection *vanitas* of this śl — B<sub>1</sub> *raṅgartham*, D *ratnavatnam* — does not affect the sense I greatly doubt, whether *raṅgartham* may have in good Sanskrit the meaning of 'for keeping for himself' and for this reason should prefer the reading of D

58 98 In the story of Vajrasena whose wife cut off his nose and ears (T II 11 foll) the ironical turn of the poet's words representing the state of mind of the foolish husband whom his passion of sensual love compels to deliver himself to the rage of his faithless wife is almost lost in the corrupted form of śl 98 b in B<sub>1</sub> for *citra* as is edited there, D has *citraṁ* having the line as follows

*trinasarikṛtaḥ citraṁ I aṅgasauro Manobhūta*

it is a wonder how a Vajrasena [= who has the hardness of a diamond] was made by the Love god to a *trinasāra* [= who has the hardness of stubble]<sup>9</sup> — Some lines before, śl 91 a D reads *upateṣya* for *upateya* (B) rightly, for when he had entered the den of wood, he made sit down his wife before speaking to her

113 114 In the relation of the prowess of Sindhavala fighting lions and elephants in the wilderness two variances of reading are remarkable, since they slightly change the meaning According to D, he did not strip the elephant whom he killed of his jewel (I II 16) but he made the

elephant fall down roaring. Instead of *mukhtaratnam* (B.) D reads *mukhtaratum*, ep 52, 123 where the same adj is found, in the same situation, in both editions (cp also 70, 94 the partic *aratatam*). And in the comparison of the bandits overthrown by him with lotusponds trampled down by an elephant, D adds the adjunct „fresh” to the subst “lotus-es”, it reads cl 114 thus

*ekukī taskaracamur idalan narapaukajāh*  
*manūthūrayavikrantah karī kamalinir na*

By this the *çloka* recovers its genuine form. In Br’s text (*idalann na*) the repeated *na* is intolerable, and *paukajāh* (acc fem.) disturbs the sentence. In D *narapaukajāh* is a bahuvrīhi and the attribute of *kamalinir*.

139 *Samam* (Br) appears from D to be a mistake. In D the tristubh is edited in its original form

*tatah sa samprapya punah svarajyam*  
*āriya bharyām ca pitur gṛhāt tām etc*

60, 154 D = 155 B. In the Story of the Lion, the Panther, the Crow and the Jackal it is related how the attendants of the wounded lion contrive a plot by which they will induce the camel to offer himself his own body to the lion. The crow who is charged with the execution of the contrivance entices the camel by a false message to make that offer. This part of the story is introduced by a *çloka* which is somewhat different in B. and in D. B. *ity ukte tan, anujātas tena sinkhena vāyasah*

*vidhāya samvidam gatvā karabham tam abhāshata*

D the first line identical, the second *vidhāya samvidam kṛtvā karabham etc*. We may supersede to demonstrate that and why D’s reading seems to be better. Sanskrit T’s translation (II, 36) should be modified, in accordance with it, in this manner „When they had said this, the crow, by the permission of the lion, after arranging the plot to kill him, addressed that camel with these words”

61, 126 The snare in which the antelope Citrāṅga is caught, is called *kālapāça* in Br — in T’s translation (II, 32) „the fatal noose” — but *kālapaça* in D, which word is expressive of the kind of trap used, some pin or wedge being employed

145 foll In this passage, which treats of the beautiful wife of a jealous husband falling in love with a young Bhilla

with whom she elopes from her house (T II, 53), Tawney has adopted (çl. 147) the reading *pallim* from his MS instead of *palnim* (B<sub>1</sub>). D likewise has *pallim* and these more corrections of B<sub>1</sub>'s text çl 145 *muge sa Bhallūm alarim agre dr̥ṣṭā sa lodbhayāt*, çl 146 *dhr̥ṣṭā yayau lalah* for *dr̥ṣṭā* („she boldly eloped”)

62, 13 and The word *aradya* ‘blameful’ has been twice obscured  
103 in this taṅga in B<sub>1</sub>, whereas it reappears in D The first line of çl 13

*yoddharyam tena sākam no gataṁ ‘araṣena çatunnā* (B<sub>1</sub>) has this form in D

*y t s no krtāvadyena çatunnā* = „we must fight with that enemy who acted blamefully towards us”. T (II, 64) translates „we must go and fight with that feeble enemy”. Neither the idea of weakness nor its expression here by *araca* fit the situation, but *krtavadya* represents the very idea wanted and is its proper expression.

Çl 103 *krtāvadyasya* (B<sub>1</sub>) is an obvious misprint for *krtāvadyasya*. I do not understand why T (II, 71) has rendered it by „a hereditary enemy”.

63, 108 In T's translation, II, 84, begins the famous story of the Monkey and the Porpoise, which Somadeva narrates at large and with amplifications. With him, the wife of the porpoise has a confidante by whose intermedium she makes known to her husband her desire of being cured with a soup made of the heart of a monkey. The porpoise reflected „Alas! how shall I obtain the lotus like heart of a monkey? Is it right for me to plot treachery against the monkey, who is my friend? On the other hand how else can I cure my wife whom I love more than my life? In this reflection which I quote from T, there is nothing inconsistent, but the words „how else can I cure’ do not answer exactly to the text of B<sub>1</sub> *sādhyā kim athavā bhūrya*, since not *kim athavā*, but *katham* or *katham anyatha* would be required to represent that meaning. From D it appears that something different is said. Instead of *sādhyā* it has *sakhyā*, and the whole line has accordingly this form, in transcription and adding the punctuation *sakhyā kim? athavā bhūryā prānebhyaḥ py adhikopriyā* = „What matters me my friend? It is my wife, forsooth, whom I love more than my life”.

- 168 In the odd story of the teacher and his two jealous pupils (T II, 88) there is a trait which, owing to the bad reading in Br, is misrepresented. The pupil who washed and anointed every day the right foot of his teacher being abroad, the teacher asks his second pupil who was in charge of his left foot, to wash and anoint the right one also. That pupil refused, as the right foot belonged to his rival. When the teacher insisted, then that pupil, *who was the opposite of a good pupil*, took hold of his master's foot in a passion, and exerting great force, broke it. The words printed in italics are wrong; they rest on Br's false reading

*tato vipakṣhaḥ sa cīṣhyād iśhād adaya tasya tam*

*guroḥ cīṣhyah sa caranam balād gādhaḥ ca bhagnavān*, here the awkward and not idiomatic expression *vipakṣah sacchīyat* to denote 'a bad pupil', the tasteless style unworthy of an elegant poet such as Somadeva, and the strange turn *balād gadhat* made me a priori suspicious about the genuineness of the lines thus edited. All this trouble vanishes if we adopt the redaction of D

*tato vipakṣat acchīyaroṣud adaya tasya tam*

*guroḥ cīṣyah sa caranam balad graṇa ca bhagnavān* = then this pupil in a fit of anger at the (other) pupil, his rival took hold of that foot of his master and broke it violently with a stone

- 179 D = 180 Br The story of the snake with two heads" contains several various readings in Br and D which do not affect the meaning. A bad reading of the concluding śloka which he found in his mss. induced Brockhaus to suppose a gap of one śloka between 178 and 180. This is quite unnecessary, if we read with D

*avate 'ḡṇau paribhāṣto margadrāṣter adahyata*

- 184 D = 185 Br In the story of the foolish man who had put a handful of rice into his mouth in the house of his father-in-law and was surprised by his mother-in-law it is said in P's translation (II, 89) 'his mother-in-law, seeing that his throat was swollen and distended'. Of course there can be no question of his throat, though Br edits *gala*, D has the very word required here, *galla tatpūocchunagallam ca*. This correction restores at the same time the fault against the metre in Br. He had not a swollen throat, but a swollen cheek

- 61, 101 \* Dhanadeva returning home is informed of the misconduct of his dissolute wife. She lets down every night a basket, „and whoever enters it is drawn up into the house, and is dismissed in the same way at the end of the night. And the woman is always stupefied with drink, so that she is absolutely void of discernment.” (T II, 96)  
 The last sentence is çl 101, c d. In B<sub>1</sub> it has this shape

*pāna-mattā 'araçā nana vicārayati kimcana*

In D it is edited as follows

*pānamattā ca sū nana nibhālayati kimcana*

*Pānamattā* must be a misprint, B<sub>1</sub> *pānamattā* is right. But the other variance of D, which I have marked by spacing, restores the original wording, misread by B<sub>1</sub>. Note the new instance of the verb *nibhālayati* 'to consider' — In çl 102 D *bahukālo gato* is also an improvement (Br *bahukālagato*).

67, 57

The merchant who tells Naravāhanadatta his adventures, narrates his despondency, when the news was spread of the shipwreck of the vessel on which his bride made the journey to Ceylon. „So I, though comforted by my elders, made up my mind to throw away my property and prospects and I determined to go to that island to ascertain the truth” (T II, 128). The words printed in italics are the translation of the pāda *cittam āçābhī akṣipam* (Br), which for several reasons rouse doubt as to their genuineness. D, in fact, has a much better reading *cittam āçābhī akṣipam*. The merchant says, that after the consolation of his elders, *he cherished his mind with hope and determined etc.*

70, 31

Çrntadhī after saying his name and that of his father, thus continues

(B<sub>1</sub>) *sa ca mayā saha*

*durbhikṣhe mṛtajātīḥ san bhīman prāpad imām bhūmam*  
 „and once in a time of famine he was wandering about with me, and he reached this place almost dead” (T II, 148). These last words 'almost dead' have to render *mṛtajātīḥ*, but this translation is impossible. The compounds in *°jātīya* are synonymous with those ending in *°kalpa* = 'almost', but not those in *°jāti*, and if *mṛtajāti* signifies anything, it must be = 'having lost by death his clan (or caste)'. Br's reading is the consequence of a misreading. D has *mṛtajāntāḥ* 'having lost by death his wife', and

so Somadeva wrote, as is confirmed by the parallel passage in Kṣemendra, where the cause of her death, too, is reported. She starved from hunger, after giving away her food to a beggar.

*tataḥ kadācit durbhikṣe mātā me nyabhōjanam*

*dattvārtine kṣudhātāya dhanyā tatyūjajvītam* (IX, 1, 196)

- 95 In this śloka the interrupted meditation of some merciful ascetic is mentioned 'who discharged fire at the webs' (T II, 151) of two sets of spiders, hanging one on wholesome flowers and the other on poisonous flowers.

This allegorical representation of the power of tapas and dhyāna to destroy the textures of karma, though consistent with the whole imagery sketched, is not quite accurate if tested by the very words of the original. T translated Bī *kenāpi jālato mukhā tato jvālā tapasvinā*. Now, it is impossible to express the conception „to discharge fire at the webs” by the words *jālato jvālām muñcati*. The word ending in *tas* can only signify the source of the fire, not its aim. Here again, D restores the hand of Somadeva, who wrote *kenāpi bhūlato mukhā* etc., the ascetic made fire break forth out of his forehead. Cp Īva's front-eye, e.g. Kathās 104, 2, where *bhalekṣana* has remained intact in Br. Bīhaṭkathāmnajari, IX, 1, 236, the parallel place has also *tallalātāsamutthugā*.

- 71, 39 The queen says to the warden, apud T (II, 156) „When the king was seized that day by monsters in the water of the Narmadā, Mṛginkadatta alone was ready to rescue him” I do not object to this translation, but the verb *was seized*, which is here indispensable, does not answer to Br *āghrāto bhūt*. One would rather expect *akrānto 'bhūt*, as is, in fact, found in D.

- 147 An anuvāra wrongly put, or perhaps even wrongly believed to have been put on the aks 𑀅 has disturbed the wording of the first line of this śloka in Br T (II, 161) thus translating „Out on the spite of destiny! she brings trouble on her handiwork, even when full of excellencies” made the best of it. But his rendering of *ahhah* (sm) by 'trouble' proves his conviction that a literal translation would lead him to nonsense. Now, if we put together Br's text

*gunavatyām sva-sriṣṭāv apy anko, dhig matsaro vidheh!*  
and that of D (which I transcribe, adding the punctuation)

*gunavatyām svasiṣṭāv apy aho dhim matsaro vidheh!*  
there can be no doubt, I suppose, that the latter alone is right Hamsāvahī exclaims „O! What a pity that Destiny feels jealousy towards her creation, even when full of excellencies!”

- 252 In Hamsāvahī's outcry the words *hā vīparītamdhe vidhe!* (Br) are translated by T (II, 167) „alas! Destiny, source of untowards events!” But *mdhi* means ‘treasury’ not ‘source’, if T had put ‘treasury’, the likeness would have lost its proper application. Br has been induced into error, it seems, by his MSS reading °*mdhe* instead of °*vidhe*, as is edited in D, which makes a better meaning „Alas! she cries, Destiny, operator of wrong decisions”  
Cp *supra*, p 70

- 295 *Udghāta* has been misunderstood by T (II, 169) He was misled by the acc pl in Br. From D it is clear that the right reading is *smṛtūdgātāt*, abl sing. *Udghāta* has among others the meaning ‘lunt’, ‘allusion’ — cp PWK, I, 231, s. v. 5) „das zur Sprache kommen” testif Kathās 17, 3 —, and so it must be understood here. Owing to Çrutadhī's lunt about the wondrous peacock, the king of the Bhūllas changes his mind. Parallel places of ours are 35, 27 and 68, 11 *taḥ chrutana tadudghātāt smṛtū*, where Br has *udghātāt* „fehlerhaft für *udghāta*” PWK, I 234 Cp Kathās 3, 65 *upodghāta* with a similar sense, and 27 79 in both places this word is a neuter. *Mudrarakāśa* Act III (beginning) *kim anena iha pranaharena kathodghātana?*

- 72, 292 The young merchant Malayamalin has miserably fallen in love with the king's daughter. His friend, on hearing that cause of his sorrow and altered state, reminds him of the hopelessness of his love. „Let the swan, he says, desire the beautiful face of the lotuses of all ordinary lakes, but what has he to do with the delight of enjoying the lotus of that lake, which is the navel of Viṣṇu?” (T II, 185) By the bye, I remark that there is here perhaps some pun on *lakṣmī*, which T has translated by ‘delight’, and which may also signify the wife of Viṣṇu. In fact, the princess is as distant from the merchant as



Lakṣmī is from the swan But it is not for this reason that I treat of this place but because of the discrepancy between B<sub>1</sub> and D Br's text runs thus (292 h 293 a)

*‘Iaṁso vañclatu nama anyā sarō vibhja mukha śrīyam  
hari nabhi Iradambloja bloja lakṣmya sa kal punak’*

whereas D reads

*Iaṁso vañclatu namanyasarovibhasuklāśrīyam*

*Harinabhi Iradamblojablogalakṣmya sa kal punak’*

The reading *sukla* for *mukla* is an evident connection as to the genitive *‘lakṣmya’* it satisfies better than the instrumental of B<sub>1</sub>'s text which it is not easy to account for The genitive is the dative like one cp Jātaka malī p 221 15 *has to alarī varapradanasya* Used in this manner with *la* it is a synonymous turn with the usual idiom *kṛa kṛa ca* (cp my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 410 Rem and Kathis 74 204)

296 Instead of the meaningless last part of B<sub>1</sub> *taya aritya alarot kṛiyak* P (note on II 185) from one London MS reads *taya dṛityakarot* etc D has *tayā irttyakarot kṛiyak*

73 81 101 (B<sub>1</sub>) *prākṛisṭabhyam* D has *praviṣṭabhyam* which is more appropriate to the situation Instead of bestowing on the goddesses Cū and Śrīśrī who claim each for herself the superior rank in Kṛṣṇa that paradise on earth the *epiteton ornans* glorious the text of D makes them contend at the time of their entrance in that divine country After *penetrating into* Kṛṣṇa (and becoming aware of its wondrous loveliness) they exclaim one *alarī atrodhika* and the other *nilarī* [= *na alarī* Br]

74 226 From the IO MS I (note on II 226) has adopted the reading *dhutam anuddṛitya* for *anugatya* (B<sub>1</sub>) which is out of place D has another reading quite satisfactory and almost equivalent to *anuddṛitya* viz *anadritya*

75 41 foll In the description of King Vikramāditya leaving his palace in the dark night alone and unperceived to seek the sorcerer — introduction of Vet lapinevinnatiki — D corrects B<sub>1</sub>'s text in several places Besides that (vs 40) it divides in accordance with Boethlingk *Ureslor allie* p 110 30 *pratipannī tu* The two following ślokas have this form

pradośe nilāśanaś tama laḥ ita pēkharah  
niyayaṁ rajadhūntaḥ khaḍgaruṁ alakṣitaḥ ||  
yayaṁ ca ghorambīdadhūntaḥ utamaśiṁ masam  
citana loḥaṇa yaṇaḥ ālāḍhaṁ madarṣaṇam || .

Whether *nayana* is the right correction of *tayana* (B), is not certain, but in the first line the new reading seems to make a better sense than B's *malavasanasa malanki taṣekhaṇa* 1), which is not quite = 'T (II, 233) 'he enveloped his head in a black cloth'. According to D, the king had taken the precaution to wear a black dress and to paint a dark brown tilak on his forehead (*tamālakī taṣekhaṇa*).

- 62 D tasyabhuḍ Vapramukulas tanayo rāpaṣaṇiṇyayoh  
 kṛi vuno darpadalanam Smarasyaṇiṇanasya ca  
 kṛiṇṇo for akaro (lh) restores the grammatical structure  
 of the sentences

- 80 T (II 235), 'What! did you not see what she told you by her signs?' These words of the minister's son to the prince convey the very meaning of their Sanskrit original yet in Bh (and consequently in Boethlingk's *Christ* - p 113) they are badly expressed the line

*tim na diriklam taya, gad yat samjaya suetlam taya*  
 can have no other meaning but this did you not see,  
 whatsoever she told etc' D restores the genuine wording  
*taya tad yat etc.* 2)

- 140 This cloke has become almost unintelligible owing to a mistake in transcribing of B, it seems. He has edited  
*ind munca manyam elasyant bandha tyagan muktamanah*  
*kuyas tram harane gultam rakshayivy ulrayany ahar*  
 from the spelling °*tyagan* and from the interpunction we may suppose that B took °*tyagan* for an acc. plur. thus reception and the strange asyndeton of the two verbs one being a future and the other a present tense raise a strong presumption of corruption. P (II, 239) translated rather the purport of his Sanskrit text than its very words. His translation, "persuade the high spirited woman to leave her relations, and I will invent and tell you in artifice for carrying her off" is virtually right. The right constitution of the text appears from D. I subjoin it adding the interpunction

) So in italics, for Br  $\pi$  it there is an error of print

<sup>a)</sup> Flowers by *g*ut must be read with D 118, 167, where Br 1 *is* *lat*

*tan muñca manyum etasyām' bandhutyāgūn mahātmanah*  
*kuryās tām harane yuktim, rakṣyāmy ālocya yām aham*  
 the gen *mahātmanah* depends on *harane* and *bandhuty*  
 is an abl sing

- 78, 37 Viravara, the heroic officer, who is immediately ready to execute the perilous order of the king, his master, sets out for the weeping woman in the darkest of the night (cf 36) It is very strange that the poet should describe his behaviour, when starting, so awkwardly as is done in Br's edition

*nata meghāndhakāram tay-jalad uryud ilocanam*

*sthūla dhāru ṣilā varṣa Rakṣo jūam ayanat* (37), in T's translation (II, 252) rendered thus „He looked upon the world as a Rākṣasa black with fresh clouds, having the lightning flashing from them by way of an eye, running large drops of rain instead of stones” It is not the comparison of the dark raining night to a Rākṣas which wonders the reader most, but the poet's remark that this imagination rose up in the mind of Viravara Now, in D the reading is slightly different, but brings us the natural and proper conception which is wanting in Br for *nata* it has *na ca*, and for *Rakṣo jūam* *Rakṣorupam* Further *tay* should be loosened from the compound *jalad*<sup>o</sup> and put aside as a separate word The whole, then, means this „He did not mind that Rakṣas-like darkness, black etc”

80. 10 T, in his note 2 on II, 312, mentions the reading *tathā* of the Sanskrit College MS for *taya* (Br) Br's *prishṭo mātṛā taya* must be corrupt, as *tayā* cannot be accounted for But the true correction is in D *piṣṭo mātṛārtaya* when his mother distressed asked him the cause (of his strange behaviour)”

- 81, 16 The king being astray in the wilderness, asks his dependent and only companion „Do you know the way by which we came?” The other replies „I do know it, but let my lord rest here for some time” (I II, 265 in fine) T translated well that which must be read in the text, but is not in Br, where we find *cedm*, *kimcit kṣanam tavad ita vīcramyate prabhuh* the good reading *cedm kimca kṣanam* etc is found in D

- 82, 17 In the conclusion of the ludicrous tale of „the three fastidious men” who being gone off to fetch a turtle

for their father in behalf of his sacrifice never returned, having made their fortune at the court of a foreign king, the poet laughingly states that little did they reckon of the fact that they had merited sin by obstructing their father's sacrifice' (I II, 273) The half śloka of the original translated in this manner is thus edited in Bī

*pitar vighnita yajñārtham helopāṣṭa pātakah*

The word *hela* is inconvenient if expressive of the obstruction of the *ies* divya, it is a tautology next to *vighnita*, if it denotes the insult wherewith they acted to their father, the word implies too much, for they were guilty of *apamada*, not *hela*. Moreover, the whole expression *yajñārtham heli°* is improper. In fact, the text in Bī is corrupt. The true reading is found in D

*pitar vighnitayajñārthaphaloparjitapātakah*

= 'though they had merited sin by obstructing the success of their father's sacrifice'

86 36 \* It is plain that D reading the second part of this śloka

*evad avastāṣayanam meum mantri munya tum*  
is right, not Bī where it has this form *evad apastāṣayanam* etc. I's translation (II 286) the minister, who had long disordered the use of beds spent that night in his house is materially satisfactory but does not exactly answer to the necessary meaning of the phrase *evad avastāṣayanam* which must imply that Dīghadugm had a long time ago, taken a vow of not sleeping in a bed *avastāṣayanam* = I at *abjecto lecti usu* D's text signifies that after a long time (*evad*) he had got (again) a bed to pass the night etc

88 11 12 Br has here made an odd mistake editing *malya manah* and *malyamake* in a place where it is said that the town was robbed by thieves. The right reading *murya°* and *murya°* is of course found in D

89 76 Murharisami, feigning to require ce to an unjust decision of the king concerning himself, protests indirectly by pointing out the king's responsibility for his own actions. In Br this passage runs as follows  
*kamari tad astu, raja haṁ dharmadharman tava icitan*  
= I (II 301) I must I suppose, require ce you are a king and justice and injustice are matters familiar to you. How much better D *dharmādharman tava idya*  
*tau* = from hence the righteousness or injustice

(of that which is to be done) is yours," it is not I who am responsible for it, but you (who are the dispenser of the *dharma*) who are to enjoy the fruit of the right or injustice you have done by your sentence. So we have caught the very argument in the case from an Indian point of view.

91, 60 Cl 32—60 contain the verdict of Tivikramasena in the case of the king who died from unsatisfied love rather than to accept the ravishing Unmādinī from the hand of her husband. In its conclusion I prefer D's reading *pīnūn api sa dharmātma tatyāja na punah padam/amārge nidadhe* to B *praman api samantāt ca tatyāja* etc., *samantāt* is a mere *pīdapurima*, but nothing can be more appropriate to the context here than *sa dharmātma*.

93, 9 In Br it is said that the relations of the merchant Dhanapala after his death „seized his property, as the king did not interfere to protect it" (T II, 323). The words I have put in italics answer to *rājāsānāthyād (ākramam)* of B. D has thus slightly different text

*taddhanam rājasanūthyād ākramānam attha gotrajāṭh,* which imports the very contrary, viz. that the relatives robbed the widow of the inheritance *with the assistance of the king*. D's text is supported by Ksemendra's parallel (IX B 1018) *gotrajāṭh/hantum dānam ākṛptu tadbhāryu rājasamṣritāṭh* = „his relations backed by the king sued his wife to seize the inheritance."

94, 91 King Candivarloka is bound to the Brahmarakṣas, whom he had unwillingly obstructed, to deliver him a brāhman boy of seven years ready to offer himself in sacrifice for the king's sake. When being in a downcast mind how to fulfil his promise, one of his ministers shows him the way to find out such a boy. „He had made with the utmost rapidity a golden image of a seven years old child, and he adorned his ears with jewels and placed it on a chariot, and had it carried about in the towns, villages, and stations of herd-men," with a proclamation of this purport, that if such a brāhman boy is whose image was being carried about, should willingly offer himself for the good of all the creatures, and his mother and father should permit him to do so and should comply to some other hard and requisite conditions, this image of gold and gems together with

a hundred villages would be given them in reward. In the passage quoted from T's translation (II, 339) the sentences „he adorned his ears with jewels, and placed it on a chariot” are to render this line of Br *ratnan alamkṛitām tām ca karne, rathārpitām*. It is clear, however, that „to adorn the ears (of the image)” cannot possibly be expressed in Sanskrit by *alamkṛitām* (viz. *ṣṛṇuṣū*) *karne*, and that this phrase is rather a monstrous lection. Now, in D this monstrum disappears. For *karṇe rathārpitām* it has *karṇārthārpitām*. So the translation is thus to be modified „He had made with the utmost rapidity a golden image of a seven-year-old child and dressed it with ornaments, then he placed it in a palanquin, etc.” The word *karṇārtha* is found also 27, 168, in both Br and D, at 120, 118 D and T's three mss have *karṇārthavatinā* (see T II, 570 n 1), this has been corrupted in B to *karṇārthārpitā*.

95, 4 *ṭayām* [viz. *pratyām*] *babhūva nṛpatih Padmanābha ity igrutah sajjananandakah śrīmūn ākrānta Balaṅjakaḥ*

T (II, 342) rendered this śloka thus „In it there lived a fortunate king, named Padmanābha, who was a source of joy to good men, and excelled king Bali.” T failed to realize the intentional ambiguousness of the epithets King Bali mentioned in the 1<sup>st</sup> pīḍa needs requires in the name of Padmanābha an allusion to Viṣṇu, one of whose names is, indeed, Padmanābha. Now, D has in the 3<sup>rd</sup> pada *saccakṛānandakah*. Adopting this reading, we get a worked out pun. King P is compared throughout with Viṣṇu, the possessor of his good discus (*śakṛā*) and his sword Nandaka, who overpowered (*ākṛānta*) king Bali. If referred to the king, it is said that he was a source of joy to the pious, and brought into his power tributary kings (*Balaṅja*), cp *supra* p 82.

98, 35 D *muktā tū raughamanditam* seems to be preferable to B *muktāhāraughā*, for it is not the fact of her being „adorned with many strings of pearls” (T II, 356), but the striking splendour of her pearls of the finest water that makes impression on the mind of Candasmīti. *Tura* has here meaning S) in PW, III 55.

99, 13 The act of sacrifice to the Vetāla, performed by the mendicant, consists of different oblations. The first of them, in B, is an offering „of white human teeth in a

skull' (*sunirmalath / nara dantak*) by way of an *aigha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*sun nararakantak*) that is offered as an *aigha*.

- 12 After finishing his long narrative the 25 Tales of the Vetala, Vikramakesarim comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an *aupacchandasika*, the third and fourth *pādas* of which are in B

*abhidhaya punar Mrigunkadattam*

*śaśvatārtham nyagāda rajaputram*

It is no wonder that T could not understand *śaśvatārtham*, finding in one of his mss. *śa kīrtartha* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly the successful prince M" (II, 360). But since in fact M is styled here 'successful' in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *kīrtartha*, before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 4<sup>th</sup> *pāda*

*prakīrtarthaṃ nyagāda rajaputram*

spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject.

- 46 The old man, after giving to Vikramakesarim the powerful spell by means of which he will regain Mṛigunkadatta his master exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent's poison. The calm stanza which conveys this exhortation is corrupt in its 4<sup>th</sup> *pāda* and the word *dulśarpa* does not occur in it. In Br the *pāda* has this shape

*tvam evaṃ dulśarpa dāṣṭvātīlāta,*

but in D we have doubtless the good reading

*tvam me bandhul śarpadamvātīlāta*

I hold you for my kinsman since you have rescued me of the pain of a serpent's bite. cp I II 361.

- 100 21 In the simile which illustrates the wavering of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mṛigunkadatta beholds on the shore of the lake the voices of the birds are forced to say 'not I, let no one question me in any way' (I II 363), but 'let no one touch me in any way'. D reads *na muṃ gātā tatha karoti sprakṣid it,* not *prakṣid it* (ib.).

- 57 The pathyā-strophe that relates the reunion of Mṛigunkadatta with his ministers, runs thus in Br

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadi mantrināḥ prāpya tan  
 dīṣṭvā kalatayā gūḥ pramada manthanāmbhayaḥ |  
 nareṣvāra suto dhīra prāṇayāmaśam eśam muhur  
 dadarśa, parivāśāya tad anu sambabhāṣhe kṛitī ||*

Here the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *kalataya* put between *dṛṣṭvā* (with his eyes) and *gūḥ* (with his voice) Bochtlingk declared it a misprint for *kalānaya* = 'with his gestures' see PW V, 1264, yet *kalānā* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK II, s. v. under 3 c) on no other authority but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada manthanāmbha* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well known term for churning to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a voice agitated by the workings of joy (T II 365). Both difficulties are removed in D, where we read

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadi mantrināḥ prāpya tan  
 dīṣṭvā kalatayā gūḥ pramadamanthanāmbhayaḥ |  
 nareṣvāra suto dhīra prāṇayāmaśam eśam muhur  
 dadarśa parivāśāya tad anu sambabhāṣhe kṛitī ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *yathāsamākhya* which connects the three instruments in the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda with the verbs in the 1<sup>st</sup> one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*eśam eśam*). Therefore I think its translation must be modified in this manner. Then the prince having received all those ministers at the same instant looked at them with his eyes, embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice owing to the emotion of his exceeding love so he saluted them one by one again and again happily by his success.

101, 278 A bad orthography misled Prof. Brockhaus it seems when he put into his text *abjeyā śulikā* — in his translation (II 350) the beautiful lotuses, but *śulikā* = beautiful would be hardly defensible in this connection! In editing *abjeyā śulikā* the lotuses with their bees, has preserved the genuine word, which is both in accordance with *pluttisā vallisā*, its parallel in the preceding link of this chain of absolute locatives and necessary since it is the humming of the bees but



skull' (*sunumalark / nara dantark*) by way of an *argha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*sun nararakark*) that is offered as an *argha*.

- 42 After finishing his long narrative the 25 Tales of the Vetāla, Vikramakesarī comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an *upacchandāsika* the third and fourth pādis of which are in B

*abhidhaya punar Mṛgāṅkadattam*

*śakṛtārtham nyagada rājaputram*

It is no wonder that T could not understand *śakṛtārtham*, finding in one of his mss *sa kṛtārtham* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly 'the successful prince M' (II, 360). But since in fact M is styled here 'successful' in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *kṛtārtha* before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 4<sup>th</sup> pādi

*prakṛtārtham nyagada rājaputram*

spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject'

- 46 The old man after giving to Vikramakesarī the powerful spell by means of which he will rejoin Mṛgāṅkadatta his master exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent's poison. The gīṇ stanza which conveys this exhortation is corrupt in its 4<sup>th</sup> pādi and the word *dulśarpa* does not occur in it. In Br the pādi has this shape

*tam evaṁ dulśarpa dantarkṣat*

but in D we have doubtless the good reading

*tam me bāṇhul śarpadamanṭalut*

I hold you for my kinsman since you have rescued me of the pain of a serpent's bite. cp. I II 361

- 100 21 In the simile which illustrates the wavering of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mṛgāṅkadatta beholds on the shore of the lake the voices of the birds are likened to six not 'let no one question me in any way' (I II 363) but 'let no one touch me in any way'. D reads *ni mūḥ galla tatha kavet* *śprakṣid it*, not *prakṣid it* (B).

- 57 The pithy distich that relates the reunion of Mṛgāṅkadatta with his ministers, runs thus in Br

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadi mantrināḥ prāpya tān  
 dr̥ṣṭvā kalatayā gṛāḥ pramada manthanāmbhayā |  
 nareṣvāśuto dhīra prāṇayāṁ ekam ekam muhur  
 dadarśa, pariśaśajate tad ann sambabhāṣke kṛtī ||*

Here the 2<sup>d</sup> pīḍa puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *kalatayā*, put between *dr̥ṣṭvā* (with his eyes) and *gṛāḥ* (with his voice) Boettlingk declared it a misprint for *kalāṇayā* = 'with his gestures, see PW V, 1264, yet *kalāṇā* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK II, s. v. under 3 c) on no other authority, but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada-manthanāmbhā* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well known term for „churning”, to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a „voice agitated by the workings of joy” (P II, 365). Both difficulties are removed in D, where we read

*tatah sa sakalān samam sapadi mantrināḥ prāpya tān  
 dr̥ṣṭvā kṛtāyā gṛāḥ pramadamanthanāmbhayā |  
 nareṣvāśuto 'dhīra prāṇayāṁ ekam ekam muhur  
 dadarśa pariśaśajate tad ann sambabhāṣke kṛtī ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *yathāsamākhya* which connects the three instrumentals in the 2<sup>d</sup> pīḍa with the verbs in the 1<sup>st</sup> one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*ekam ekam*). Therefore, I think its translation must be modified in this manner. „Then the prince having recovered all those ministers at the same instant looked at them with his eyes, embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice owing to the emotion of his exceeding love, so he saluted them one by one, again and again happy by his success’

101, 278 A bad orthography misled Prof. Brockhaus, it seems when he put into his text *abhyas cālita* — in his translation (II, 350) „the beautiful lotuses, but *cālita* = ‘beautiful’ would be hardly defensible in this connection! D, editing *abhyas sālita* „the lotuses with their bees,” has preserved the genuine word, which is both in accordance with *phullasā cālita*, its parallel in the preceding link of this chain of absolute locatives; and necessary, since it is the humming of the bees but

skull (*sunumalark / nara dantark*) by way of an *argha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*sun nararakta*) that is offered as an *argha*.

- 42 After finishing his long narrative the 25 tales of the Vetala, Vikramakesum comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an anupachandrika the third and fourth padas of which are in B.

*abhidhaya puna Mrigankadattam*

*śakrtartham nyagada rajaputram*

It is no wonder that T could not understand *śakrtartham* finding in one of his mss. *sa krtartham* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly the successful prince M" (II 360). But since in fact M is styled here successful in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *krtartha* before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 1<sup>st</sup> pada

*pralīrtarthaṃ nyagada rajaputram*

spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject

- 46 The old man after giving to Vikramakesum the powerful spell by means of which he will rejoin Mrigankadatta his master exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent's poison. The *śloka* which conveys this exhortation is corrupt in its 4<sup>th</sup> pada and the word *dulśarpa* does not occur in it. In B the pada has this shape

*ham eva i dulśarpa daṇḍitaśto*

but in D we have doubtless the good reading,

*ham me bandhul śarpada i vilāto*

I hold you for my kinsman since you have rescued me of the pain of a serpent's bite. cp I II 361

- 100 21 In the simile which illustrates the wavering of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mrigankadatta beholds on the shore of the lake the voices of the birds are likened to sea not. Let no one question me in any way! (I II 363) but Let no one touch me in any way! D reads *na na yatlī tatla ka ci* *śyulāśid itī*, not *prakud itī* (B).

- 57 The prthivi trope that relates the reunion of Mrigankadatta with his ministers runs thus in B.

*tatah sa sakalan samam sapadi mantrinah prāpya tan  
dr̥ṣā kalandayā gūā pramada manthanaramblayā |  
nareṣvara suto dīkṣa prāṇayam ekaṁ ekaṁ muhur  
dadarṣa, pariśasajye tad ann sambabhūṣke kṛtī ||*

Here the 2<sup>d</sup> pīḍa puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *kalandaya*, put between *dr̥ṣa* (with his eyes) and *gūā* (with his voice) Boethlingk declared it a misprint for *kalanayā* = 'with his gestures' see PW V, 1261, yet *kalanā* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK II, s. v. under 3 c) on no other authority but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada manthanarambha* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well known term for 'churning', to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a voice agitated by the workings of joy (I II, 365). Both difficulties are removed in D where we read

*tatah sa sakalan samam sapadi mantrinah prāpya tan  
dr̥ṣa kalandaya gūā pramadamanthanaramblaya |  
nareṣvara suto dīkṣa prāṇayam ekaṁ ekaṁ muhur  
dadarṣa pariśasajye tad ann sambabhūṣke kṛtī ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *yathasamkhyā* which connects the three instrumentals in the 2<sup>d</sup> pīḍa with the verbs in the 1<sup>st</sup> one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*ekaṁ ekaṁ*). Therefore I think Is translation must be modified in this manner. Then the prince having recovered all those ministers at the same instant looked at them with his eyes embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice owing to the emotion of his exceeding love so he saluted them one by one again and again happily by his success.

101 278 A bad orthography misled Prof Brockhaus it seems when he put into his text *abyeṣu salise* — in Is translation (II 350) the beautiful lotuses, but *salise* = beautiful would be hardly defensible in this connection! In editing *abyeṣu salise* the lotuses with their bees' has preserved the gramm. word, which is both in accordance with *plutivā calivā* its parallel in the preceding link of the chain of absolute locatives and necessary, since it is the humming of the bees but

no sound proper to the lotuses that is represented to utter the phrase expressed in this *śloka*

- 290 The awful prison, into which Soudrasena and his companion were thrown by the Ciburis is thus described (F II 381) The prison was full of multitudes of vermin filthy with cobwebs, and it was evident that snakes frequented it as they had dropped there the skins that cling to their throats etc. What is said about the snakes is somewhat shorter in the original which, in B<sub>1</sub>, has this form *sacyamanah samantam nimokan gala lambibhik* and nothing is stated about the dropping of the skins. If we interpret this half *śloka* as philologists we can draw from it only this meaning 'frequency of snakes was betrayed by the snake skins that cling to (their) throats'. Of course this is in fact almost nonsense. D's text is more satisfactory. For *galalambibhik* it has *galatambibhik*. That the prison was haunted by serpents was to be inferred from the snake-skins that cling to the *loles* (in its walls).

- 308 Soudrasena after many adventures, has been reunited with his beloved Mandarvati and from the residence of his father's vassal where he dwells, he despatches a messenger with a letter to his old father to announce him that happy news. The messenger arrives just in time for Mahendra and his wife were preparing to enter the fire and his oral information that Soudrasena is alive and will soon come back to his parents changes their despair into joy. Then he delivers his letter

*ity udaya ca tasyaita rajal padantike nyadhat  
lekhan sa Bhillobhispitalelatalero lalan cucam*

So D whose text restore the genuine wording B<sub>1</sub> has *ralal cucal* a corruption which embarrassed Irawaty who made of *ralal* the best he could (II 381) and pretermitted *cucal*. That the messenger spoke his comforting words not in secret but aloud is plain from the sequel (cl 309) then all the people there being delighted raised a shout of joy.

- 102 29 B<sub>1</sub> *Anudaryena tall lalica brahmacariya*

D *Anudaryena tall lalibhasabrahmacariya*

That D is right not B<sub>1</sub> is plain by the comparison of 70 19 where it is narrated that the king of the Khatas had been a fellow student of Mahakandatta (*sibrahmacari*

*vidyasa sa ca bulasubha mama* says M. ibid.) F (II 389 line 1) was deceived by B's text

- 63 1 II 390 — see his note — follows in his translation one of his MSS which has *matsyanyu yablayodayat* for the nonsense which is in B's text *matsaryajablayodayat* D reads *matsjanyu jablayud ayan* (viz. *rajaçabdah*)

- 113 In B the first word *yuktan* is suspect. I (II 393) renders it with 'assembled' he construes it with *nripatin* in the 4<sup>th</sup> pāda, and translates those assembled kings. But nobody, I suppose, would translate this from English into Sanskrit by *tin nripatin yuktan*. Either Brockhaus found a bad reading in his MSS or misread the good one. D has *muktamrgamadau* etc. Durgapāṣaṭi honoured his royal guests with pearls *muk* etc.

- 103 13 In B this śloka is made up of a sentence without main predicate. *praviçya* and *tarubaddhuzat* are predicative attributes of *Vignakadattal* neither of them can be the predicate. D restores the predicate lost in B. It has *Gauryagunacramam gatah* (went to the sanctuary of Gauri) whereas B reads *Gaury ageryacramagatal* (in the front of the s. of G.)

- 109 Here D replaces *asadhyena* the first word of the śloka in B by *açitthyena* and thus renders to the word of Çrutidhī their full weight. For it is for this reason that Çrutidhī advises Mrgakadatta to act upon the invitation of Kāmarasenī because *it cannot be with an insidious purpose that he sent you this message other wise how would a powerful prince like that when his daughter had been carried off give up fighting and go home?* Cp. I II 402 who paraphrases *asadhyena* by *because he saw no other way out of the difficulty* but I scarcely believe that *asadhyena* can be used as equivalent to *açitthyataya*.

- 101 88 In the description of the lake Çukkhāhrudā where it is developed how charming this lake was by the scents and perfumes imparted to its waves from the women who bathed in it. D's text

*viclavat parivṛttaglānastānāṇḍalanī*

seems more appropriate than B's *çalāna-sthalaḥ aḍalanī*

- D 195 = Br 196 Better than in Br where *tārā yidre* looks suspect, the composition of the period appears in D. In

D's text the first word of the line is not *tadrçi*, but *yadrçam* which must be construed with the preceding the new sentence begins with *yadrçi*

*nayapi tatkrte dukkham anubhutam suduksaham  
yadrçam yadrçi caüa prapañcayacana Pulheh  
vaksyami vistarat tat te etc*

In L's translation (II 122) this would make necessary some modifications in this way. Hereafter I will tell you of what kind was the intolerable sorrow I, too, have endured for your sake and how strange a variety of effects in this phenomenal world late produces'

106 11

is rendered obscure in B. owing to one vowel. Dharmavati, the Vidyadhari has descended from the sky with her daughter Annavati whom she presents to Narayana-datta as his future wife. It is dangerous for you she adds, to stay there where you are now we will carry you to another country where you may dwell in safety for one year, until we come back to perform the marriage. Cf. 11 expresses her advice to allow her to bring him to another country she compares him to the moon in a certain state. In which? B's text

*na viduh kalyapati kim kalam parikshino ika mandale?*  
seems to hint at the time of an eclipse of the sun. Accordingly I translates (II 132) Does not the moon delay to shine when the circle of the sun is eclipsed. But what may be the meaning of this? Firstly the moon shine is wanting not only at the time of the eclipse of the sun but also always at the time of the moon's conjunction with the sun. And secondly if Narayana-datta is compared with the moon it would be consistent to say that the moon does not shine at all when it is obscured itself there is no reason why the eclipse of the sun should be mentioned. Moreover *kalam kalyapati* may signify to delay but it can never mean to delay to shine. So we must infer that B's text must contain some corruption. Indeed, D reads with a slight variant

*viduh kalyapati kim kalam parikshino rkamandale?*

Does not the moon, when he is in a state of weakness spend some time within the umbra of the sun? So the comparison receives its full light. Narayana-datta at this point of the story, is in a state of want of power which is analogous to the want of lustre of the moon,

when it is new As the moon resides with the sun, to await his time and to regain his strength, so N is to reside at Çrivastī with king Prasenjit where he may be said *lulam kseptum* Somadeva apparently plays with the double meaning of *mandala* 1 circle and 2 territory or sphere of power and of *lulam kseptum* which is not only = 'to delay' but also 'to await one's proper time'

- 69 Br *praçamsanti*, D *praçamsanti* I think, D is right not Bī 'The female apparition, who awakes Nārāyaṇa at night time to remind him of his beloved Madanamañukā speaks thus

*anyasat tam praçamsanti patim Madanamañuke  
hu hatuṣa!*

alas! Madanamañukā, you are undone! For you pursue a husband who is attached to other women With *praçamsanti* cp 77 *śaḍgunākalāpinīm*

- 118 Br's text of the line 118 a and b

*eram uktaṣṭaḥ tasya patnyā sudhyakalanurodhan*  
demands from the part of the interpreter a so great assurance of grammatical and lexicological incongruities — *sudhya* for *sudhayitva* and supposed to mean recognising the fact (I II 437) *akalanurodha* is inexplicable for sound exegesis — that D's variant must necessarily be acknowledged as representing the hand of Somadeva D reads thus

*eram uktaṣṭaḥ tasya patnyā kalānurodhan  
Nārāyaṇanadatto ullaṣṭhayan sa jagadā tam*

When N had been thus addressed by his faithful wife he taking account of the present circumstances and to her by way of calming her The italics denote my modification of D's translation

- 108, ~68

D *asu* though it changes the meaning of the hermit's words but slightly, is preferable to Br *anu* inasmuch as it improves the diction for it adds to the word indicative of the woman whose clothes are to be carried off the necessary demonstration of the group to which she belongs

- 82

I in my note on II 454, treats of this śloka, which is obviously corrupt in Bī and communicates a much better reading which he found in the Sanskrit College MS (*supra*, p 63), and which he followed accordingly in his translation D fully agrees, with the exception of *yaç ca*



in pāda c, for which it has *yac ca* 'This is, in fact, the right reading, as will be plain to him who reads the whole śloka as follows

*sacandrūrdhah Śiva 'dyāpi Harir yacca sakauṣṭubhah  
tat tayoṃ vedmī kuttanyū gocarūpatane phalam*

= „That Śiva still retains his crescent and Viṣṇu his kauṣṭubha jewel, *they have to thank for it, I am sure, that they did not fall into the clutches of a kuttanī*” The italics show my modification

- 88     Bī *‘prāptam mām ripena tadā*, but D *prāṣṭam mām* etc. As Hariṣikṣa has been thrown on the earth, the participle *prāptam* seems to be rather improper to the situation. T (II, 451) translates „when I was seized by my enemy”, rather, I think, to make something not too absurd of it, than because he held *prupta* for equivalent to „being seized”

- 132     Two Vidyādhars of the party of Naravāhanadatta come into his audience hall to inform him of the imminent attack of his foe Mandaradeva. At this news, the whole assembly are filled with anger, and the poet describes the tokens of its outburst which showed themselves in the gestures and movements of the different chieftains. So it is said of Amitagata that his „necklace, rising up on his breast as he sighed with anger, seemed to cry again and again. Rouse thyself rouse thyself, hero” (T II, 456). In the original text of Br

*hūro 'mitagater rakshasy utphullah śasatah krodhā,*

*‘uttishta 'uttishta, ca tām' iti na mukhī abravīt,*

the rising up of the necklace is expressed by the participle of the pres. *utphullah*. But neither a pres. participle is here required but a pres. verb, nor has *utphulla* another sphere of employment but to signify wide opened objects, is expanded flowers, eyes etc. For this reason, it is plain that D's reading *utphalata* for *utphullah* is a good correction. As to *utphalata* = „to jump” cp. PWK IV, 200 s. v. *phal* + *ut* and the *ā-* as *utphāta* Kathīs 26, 20

- 110, 37     In the words of the priest by which the five princesses oblige themselves, that if one among them were to marry Naravāhanadatta alone the other four should enter the fire, laying the guilt at the door of her who was wedded (T II, 471), the apostrophe (Br)

*uddheya tām ūtmā tyaktarīyo 'nyabhir asti iti*

contains the impossible turn *tyaktavyo 'stu*, I do not wonder at D reading *āstv it* instead of *astv it*!

- 75 The second line of this śloka is made up of one of the absolute locatives descriptive of the *mise en scène* of Naravāhanadatt's *abhāṣaka*. In Br it runs thus

*samgatya tūṣya-nādesu mukhareshu dyuyoshitām*  
= „and the assembled symbols of the heavenly nymphs resounded aloud” (T II, 473) The use of the absolute *samgatya* is rather strange in this connection, a participle in *°ta* would be more rational. Yet *samgata* would scarcely make a plausible correction. Brockhaus in fact, may have misread his *Forlag*. D has *mangalya* for *samgatya* and in some kinds of writing मंगल्य and संगल्य are very similar to each other. The whole line in D is

*mangalyaturyanādesu sugiteṣu dyuyoshitām*  
„at the beautiful songs of the heavenly nymphs accompanied by the auspicious sound of the (heavenly) musical instruments”

- 130 Brockhaus supposes a heuṁ after this śloka (cp T II, 476), for this reason, I believe, because *usanne kopakāle 'pi*, the first words of the śloka, seem to me to give the mention of an instant quarrel or a „period of quarrelling”, as I translate it, which however is no more spoken of in the sequel. Durgiprasād firstly states that the good reading is *usanna kopakāle*, and in a note at this śloka (p. 524 of the 2<sup>d</sup> ed.) he remarks that this is to be divided into *usann akopakāle*. He is right. The meaning is „The wives of Naravāhanadatt, though there was no opportunity then of being angry, had nevertheless contracted eye-brows and heavy eyes — for they were tipsy.” This is followed by the statement, that they went to another room to take their meal, etc. There is no gap.

- III, 77 A slight variant or rather the misreading of one akṣara comes to the detriment of the wit of Udayana when, being on the point of leaving Kauṣāmbī to become a *vanaprastha*, he rebukes his brother-in-law by a denial of the permission to be his companion in the forest. Feigning to be angry at Gopīśaka's disobedience to his order to reign in his place, he exclaims
- adyana tvaṁ anāyatta jala mithyānurtita me  
śrapadāc cyaṁamūnasya kasyajñām ko hi manyate?*

So D whereas in Br the first line ends thus *mithy anuvrttaye* Udruma says 'Lo dry you have become disobedient *showing your affection to me a sham* for who cares for the command of one who is falling from his place of power?' I have put italics, where I alter the translation of T

81 Some lines below, D has *Gopalako vah pateti* (Br — *pāti iti*) a better reading for the future, especially that in *°tr* he shall — is here the tense required

115 115 D has *anyanya* for Br *anyonya* and so both times, in the first and in the third pada, confirming T's conjecture, cp his note 2 on II 520

116, 69 The decisive single combat of Muktapahariketu and Vidyuddhivajra took place on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of the great battle. In D's text it may seem that this duel happened after sunset for it is edited there

*pañcaviṃśe dine kṣīṇe prayayoḥ saṁyayor dīpayoh  
pradhana diandīyuddhesu pravṛttestu atra saṁgare*  
I (II 527) renders this śloka. And at the end of the twenty-fifth day a series of single combats was taking place between the principal warriors of both armies *along the greater part of the line of the fight*. I have italicized the translation of both *pañcaviṃśe dine kṣīṇe* and *prayayoh saṁyayor dīpayoh*. The former may perhaps be accounted for however improbable it is but the latter is nothing but a desperate effort to draw forth something acceptable from a phrase which defies sound philological interpretation. In D both difficulties cease to exist for there we read

*pañcaviṃśe dine kṣīṇaprayayoh saṁyayor dīpayoh* etc  
= on the twenty-fifth day when the two armies were almost exhausted

79 Muktapahariketu who fights on the side of the Devas has vanquished and killed the Asura Vidyuddhivajra (76—78). Thereupon the Devas shout for joy and pour showers of flowers on the hero as usual in such cases. According to Br they did so from Svarga — *Devāḥ svargād anupadān jagadāḥ siddhau siddhau ite* — but how could they being excluded at that time from heaven and waiting for the victory of their champion to be reinstalled in their seats? For this reason I think D is right, reading the line quoted as follows *devā ca*

*na danupadam* etc the Devas, immediately after (hearing) the noise (of the fall of the Asura slain by M) cried etc" Cp Raghav 1, 14

7, 31

Princess Padmavatī has fallen in love with Muktāphalaketu and has painted her sweetheart. She addresses the picture with a pathetic declaration of her love, beginning thus — in I's translation, II, 530 — When thou didst slay the formidable Asura and deliver India how comes it that thou dost not deliver me from my woe though near me by speaking to me at my rate? As I rests on Br's text, he must have added out of his own the words 'from my woe', for they do not occur in B.

*durjayān Asurān bahū yena 'Indro rakṣitas tvaṃ,  
ālāpamātreṇa sa mām katham āraṇ na rakṣasi?*

In D the first line is identical, the second shows a slight variant which, however, entails a considerable change of meaning

*ālāpamātreṇa sa mām katham Māraṇ na rakṣasi*

how comes it that thou dost not protect me from the God of Love were it only by speaking to me? Māra = Kuma Cp the parallel passages §1 50 *idam ecto notsalate kṣanam / sthātum ima tarī prineṣam kṣamate na ca Man mathak* and 65 *strighnena hanyamānam rakṣasi mām Makaraketuna na katham*

51

§1 51 which is put at the utterance of Padmavatī and is closely connected with the preceding śloka just quoted presents a remarkable variance of reading in the two editions. In Br it runs thus

*tam eva hi smarantya me mano nirati tatksauam  
dāhyante ngam samtāpēna utkrāmantī na ca usatah*

but in D

*tam eva hi smarantya me mano nirati na kṣanam* etc

At the first aspect it will seem that the reading of the one conveys a meaning quite opposite to that of the other. And so it is. The verb *nirati* must have that signification of quiet gladness, which it has got in consequence of the contamination of the derivatives of *ni* + *ir* and *ni* + *ia*, as known from Pali *nibbata* and *utthānam* so I suppose the meaning 3) of PW s v *ia* + *ni* (VI, 376) gets its genetic basis. According to Br therefore, the sensation described in the first line is one of pleasure,

but those mentioned in the third and fourth pāda are disagreeable sensations, but in D all are tainted with the guna of *rajas*, so to speak. Not only the absence of the adversative particle, which should be indispensable in Br's text, is a formal argument for D, but it is also not consistent that a woman in the situation of Padmāvatī should speak as is thus rendered by T (II, 531) „For when I think of him, my mind is immediately refreshed,” — if translated literally, it should be „is immediately made quiet and put in calm rejoicing.” The fire of passion, not the calmness of dispassionate joy [*nirṛti* cp *nirṛta bhāva* cf 62 = „he comforted” apud T (II, 532)] is kindled by her thinking of the man whom she loves vehemently, without knowing anything about his feelings towards herself. D's text conveys a more appropriate sense „For when I think of him, *my mind is quite troubled*, my limbs burn and my breath seems to leave my body with glowing heat.”

90 Padmāvatī has come near the place, where Mukṭāphalaketu lies ill. T II, 533 „she said to herself „Let me see what his illness is, that he is lying here concealed.” The last word renders *channasyana* of Br. But as there is no reason at all to say that M is concealed (*channa*), still less to emphasize this by means of the particle *eta*, it is clear that D's reading *channasthāva* imports a by far more satisfactory meaning. It is she who spies from her hiding place the facts and sayings of Mukṭāphalaketu and his friend.

118, 18 Somadeva relates how Merudhvaja was in the habit of assisting, at the assembly of the gods on the day of the full moon in the month of Caitra (T II, 539). As this assembly met once a year, D's reading *vatsarārambhe* for Br's *vāsararāmbhe* is right. To correct „for Merudhvaja always went up to Çakra's hall at new year.”

67 It is related how the Dūtyas fight a battle with an army of men, the Dūtyas standing in the air and the men on the earth. It need no further proof to demonstrate that not Br *Dātyās tu mānushān eva sthāh bhūtala sthān babādhire*, but D *Dātyas loka sthā bhūtala sthan* etc. is the genuine reading. The Dūtyas are represented standing not in the heaven, but between heaven and earth. T (II, 542) rendered the line *duh*, notwithstanding Br's *fal* c.

reading I think, Blochhaus misread the akṣaṃ ॐ, cp *supra*, p 69 in fine

- 119 152 foll In this point of the tale of Mukṭaphaladhvaṃ and Padmāvatī their reunion after separation — a common place in love stories of that kind — is being prepared Mukṭaphaladhvaṃ has come to the temple of Śiva where Padmāvatī being invisible to him, perceives him He entered and seeing that offerings had been recently placed in front of the god prince Mukṭaphaladhvaṃ said to that companion of his Look my friend, some one has been quite recently worshipping this symbol of the god surely, that beloved of mine must be somewhere there and she must have done this worship' (I II, 557) The variance of both editions is only this that in cl 152 B<sub>1</sub> reads *devo D devam* and in 153 B<sub>1</sub> *arcito naya D arcitas taya* Yet though the latter variance is rather indifferent the former necessitates a whole change of construction For D's text requires this inter-punctuation

so 'pi praviṣya devaṃ draṣṭuṃ pratyagrapuṣṭam  
Mukṭaphaladhvaṃ devam rayasyam taṃ abhāṣata

= Mukṭaphaladhvaṃ came in to the god and seeing that the god had been worshipped recently (by offerings) he said etc D presents here a text of more elegant expression and I greatly doubt whether *Mukṭaphaladhvaṃ devam* = prince M can be tolerated in this style As to *praviṣya devaṃ* cp 26 96

- 206 Pada b of this indravamṣī stanza has been corrected from MSS by I see his note on II 560 which correction is confirmed by D but p da d which concludes this *vidhāt sa bhūtmān* (B<sub>1</sub>) = that prosperous (king of the Gandhāras) with due rites in I's translation cannot be faultless since *sa* having already found its place in pada c (*pradāt sa Mukṭaphalaketave sutam*) is here superfluous D reads *vidhāt vibhūtmān*, changing the prosperous king into a wealthy one

- 120 67 For *vyadīnam* (B<sub>1</sub>) we find in D *vyamānam* This makes a quite different meaning Vikramāditya is highly praised and according to B<sub>1</sub> it is said of him in T's translation (II 567) Surely his glory furnished the Di-po'er [= *Idli*] with the material out of which he built

up the White Island [*Āetadīpa*], the Sea of Milk, Mount Kailāsa and the Himālayas" Conceding ever so much to the habits of exaggeration and anachronism, which are proper to Eastern poetry, it is hard to set to the credit of an Indian poet that he should be supposed to make his readers accept such an enormity as the Sea of Milk and the Himālaya created after the pattern of King Vikramāditya's glory D's text conveys something more reasonable According to it, the Creator or Dispenser (*Vidhi*) surely used the *Āetadīpa*, the Sea of Milk etc as his model, when he brought V's glory into being

- 76 In the enumeration of the countries conquered by Vikramaçakti for his master Vikramāditya B<sub>1</sub> names these

*Madhyadeçak sa-Samāshṭīak, sariā Gāngā ca pūrva dīk*, which implies a very uncommon manner to express, all the eastern region of the Ganges', as T (II, 507) renders it, or „the whole eastern region, where the Ganges flows" as may rather be meant by *Ganga pūrvadīk* (!) In D there is no question of the Ganges, which in fact does not specially belong to the eastern region of India These countries subdued are named there

*Madhyadeçak sa-Saurāṣṭrah sa Vang-Āngā ca pūrvadīk* = „ and the eastern region with the land of Vanga and Anga (that is with Bengal)

- 83 A slight, but necessary correction of Br is D's text  
*ito devāññaya deva gataham praptān kramat*  
The vocative *deva* is here as properly put as *cana* (the reading of Br) is unaccountable and, therefore, passed over by T (II, 568)

- 121, 95 In the course of the ludicrous story of the gamester Thinthakarala Somadeva gives vent to this remark, that even gods avoid the contact with an impudent scoundrel, as if they were incapable to withstand him The śloka which contains this saying, is corrupt in Br

*akṣhīna bhogād viśamād drisṭvā tato 'bhayorjitāt  
durjanād iata devā apy açaṭā na bibhṛati*

In T's translation (II, 576) this is rendered somewhat obscurely „Even gods, you see, like feeble persons, are afraid of a thoroughly self-indulgent [= *akṣanabhogāt*], ruffianly scoundrel [= *viśamād durjanāt*], flushed with impunity [= *abhayorjitāt*]" Here the last epithet is

strange, for his impunity presupposes at all events the consequence of this attitude of the gods, not the source of it, *akṣinabhoga* cannot signify that which T has put for it, and finally *dr̥ṣṭū* is not translated at all (for „you see” must be the equivalent, I suppose, of *bata*) and, in fact, in this connection cannot be accounted for D's edition restores the genuine text

*akṣinadoṣād viṣamūd iṣṭāniṣṭabhayaṃ jhātū*  
*durjanād bata deṇā apy aṣaktū na bibhyaṭi*

= „Even gods, you see, as if they were incapable to withstand him, are afraid of an utterly perverted and wicked scoundrel who fearless does not at all care for good or evil (in his actions)”

155 sq

‘*Thunthākarāla*, in order to make the king demolish the temple and by this to get free his wife, „secretly buried in a forest outside the city four pitchers containing his wife's ornaments” (T II, 579)

(B) *latra 'atayām calasishu nyadhād dīkshu purād iahī*  
*kāntālamhūa-kalacān mārīya caturo bhūi*

In T's translation I find no equivalent for *mārīya* nor should I know what meaning to give to this gerund in this context. Instead of it D has *nīkhāya*, the very word we are in want of, *nyadhād nīkhāya* together = „he buried”. The following half śloka runs thus in B:

*pañcapañca-maharatna sampūnam makhāna sah*

„and one full of sets of the five precious things he buried within the city etc.” So T, who in a note accounts for the term ‘five precious things’ in D, however, we read

*pañcamam ca maharatnasampūnam makhāna sah*

= „and the fifth (pitcher), filled up with precious jewels he buried etc.” That all five pitchers contained rich ornaments and no difference is made between them, is plain from the sequel, see § 162, 167 and 171

180

(B) *tac carīṇa cet kṛtyam tava, nilocya tad, nripa,*  
*adyana 'tad dīṭam devalakam bhūmi-samam kuru'*

„So, if you care for your body's well, my sovereign, take this into consideration and this very day quickly level this temple with the earth” (T II, 580) For *nilocya* D has *nīlothya*, a reading more appropriate



to the facts. How can there be time for consideration, if the temple should be demolished this very day? Thinthākarīla says „If you desire to live, demolish the temple and level it with the earth quickly, even this very day.” *Nirlothyati* „to demolish” is also used by Somadeva 76, 30 *nirlothya mathakām*, answering to T II 244 „remove this hut and —”

122, 21 Br *sa dvyahena tiy akena 'asmai rōjñe prābhṛita putrikām  
likhita 'anyanyayā rūpa bhāngyā cūtrakāro dadau*

It suffices to observe that D reads *dvyahena dvyahena*, to understand that this variance is really an emendation of Br. So both the symmetry of the composition (cp *anyanyayā* in pāda c) and the rules of grammar concerning the *vīpśā* have got their due.

63 Vikramāditya, so it is related, had a pleasant dream, that in a very beautiful city across the sea he met with a charming lady, the man-hating princess Malayāvatī and married her. When he awoke not perceiving her he grew sad, and time going he became so afflicted that he lost his interest in everything. His door-keeper Bhadrāyudha, having heard in private the secret cause of his sorrow, induces him to paint the whole scene of his dreamed happiness on a canvas. This being done, Bhadrāyudha had a new monastery made and the picture put up there on the wall. „And he directed that in relief houses attached to the monastery, a quantity of food, with pairs of garments and gold, should be given to birds come from distant countries” (T II, 590). The sentence I have placed within signs of quotation is the translation of this śloka in Br's text:

*mathe ca 'atra 'akaroḍ dūra deśāgantuka vandinām  
satreshv anna-samākāram sa castrayuga-kāñcanam*

In D it is not „relief houses” from which he orders to take the presents destined to the birds, but one such a building, on the other hand, the food is qualified to be delicate, having the six (required) flavours. The pāda c reads in D *sattre śadrasam āhāram*.

123, 196 The boatmen, bribed by the old brahmin, push the boat where Keçata was into a place of the river where the current ran strong and, swimming themselves ashore, leave him alone to be carried to the sea. His reaching the sea is narrated in this manner in Br.

*Keçatas tu sanauko 'pi nadyā kṛitottarangayā  
 lskipto 'mbudhan vātaragāt*

= „But K was carried with the boat, by the river  
 which was lashed into waves by the wind, into the sea”  
 (T II, 603) D has

*Keçatas tu sanauko 'pi nadyā kṛitvottarangayā* etc  
 „K carried away with the boat by the river which  
 ran with high waves by the wind, was pushed into  
 the sea ”

## CHAPTER III

### CONJECTURAL CRITICISM

It has been sufficiently proved, I think in the Chapters I and II that the edition of Durgaprasad marks a considerable progress. We are filled with gratefulness towards that *upakarin*, whose labours contributed so much to the better understanding of the important text on which he bestowed his care and labour must feel somewhat sorry I think that D's edition was not out at the time when he made his translation. Nevertheless as has also been stated above it is no critical edition. Though the tradition of the text is upon the whole a good one so that the number of troublesome or difficult passages owing to corruption and deprivation of the author's words is comparatively small yet such puzzles are not wanting altogether. In such cases the absence of an apparatus criticus makes itself painfully felt. The actual state of what is really found in manuscripts is hidden in a dark *terra incognita*. The only and scanty light that sparingly illuminates small spots of it is emitted by the apparatus of Fawcett in those cases where his translation is not based on Br's text but on different readings of the manuscripts at his disposal. It is something encouraging that his corrections of that kind often confirm conjectural emendations previously proposed by scholars.

For it is a matter of course that considering at one side our ignorance of the *lectionis varietas* in the manuscripts at the other the insufficient *ars et ratio* of Br's conjectural criticism is sometimes by necessity to be resorted to. Some competent Sinitists whom some reason or other caused to attend more closely to the outer form and the elocution of the Ocean of the Stemmas of Tales did good work in that direction. First of all BERNIERSKY was obliged to ponder Br's text for the wants of his Dictionary and FAWCETT had to fulfil this task as a cautious and judicious translator. Both proposed many conjectures *de & o* among which excellent corrections. After the appearance of Br's volume III (Jimb

IX—XVIII) KERN published a paper in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1868 containing a list of conjectural emendations.

A very great number of them are incorporated in D's text. I dare not say that they have found their way thither. I hold it for more likely that they happened to agree with the readings of his new manuscripts and from thence passed into his text. However this may be the good right and the utility of conjectural criticism as *ultimum remedium* is once more attested.

Boehtlingk's corrections are dispersed in the Petropoliṭin Dictionary for this reason I give some fuller indication of those which agree with D's text as far as I have noted them. At 55 165 *śaṃprikāṃśa* for *śaṃpā*° 56 217 *śabhyā* for *śatyā* 62 188 *anokala* for *anai*° 68 11 *udgātāt* for *udā*° 68 37 *śaṃśa* for *śaṃśa* 72 20 *vandhaka* for *ī raka* 80 30 *śaṃśa* for *śa*° 98 5 *vandhālāl* for *na*° 103 30 *para śaṃśa* for *paraśp*° 118 112 and 120 25 *dhīya* for *dhīṣṭā* and *allīṣṭā* (sic) 120 39 *śaṃśaṃśa* for *śaṃśaṃśa* 120 123 *gundhāna* for *Gandhāna* 122 67 *paraśaṃśa* for *paula*°

Conjectures of Lawney confirmed by D are found 0 19 12 108 13 147 15 1 20 122 35 129 68 50 70 100 123 72 366 73 134 78 23 87 11 92 86 93 67 94 106 110 115 122 139 123 294

Conjectures of Kern similarly confirmed 5 103 56 70 57 60 00 10 63 185 01 218 66 35 72 86 81 102 86 111 90 33 91 119 101 31 186 102 113 103 64 93 104 160 107 25 30 38 112 161 113 18 117 16 120 62 121 107 122 8 123 158 121 128

Sometimes but rarely conjectural emendations not confirmed by D agree with one or more of Lawney's MSS. e.g. Kern's proposal as to 114 113

Pandit Mookerjya mended 55 184 (see 1 1 146) which emendation has been confirmed by D. Similarly that of an anonymous scholar as to 29 150 (*śaṃśa* for *śaṃśa* vid supra p 109)

The following striking corrections are not warranted by D's text. Of Lawney with respect to 22 238 21 181 (181) 2 117 216 40 167 17 117 of Kern as to 32 189 6 218 106 178 of Boehtlingk as to 73 210 (*śaṃśa* for *śaṃśa* cp 87 32 where the same correction agrees with D) 7 76 (*śaṃśa* for *śaṃśa*) Yet I would not at a moment hesitate to take them up into the text if ever I were to perform a critical edition of the Kathasārithaṃ.

Now I proceed to some proposals of conjectural criticism for my own part. I accept one passage treated in Ch II (*śaṃśa* p 120)

where I could not avoid it for a practical reason, I have hitherto abstained from bringing forth my own guesses about corruptions of the text without the support of manuscript readings. In this way the conjectural proposals after the publication of D will stay apart from those made before that time on the sole text of Br.

6, 108 I begin with correcting a slight error in a name. In tat 6, 108 *Devākṛtam tad udyūnam* must be changed into *Devākṛtim* etc., cp. ibid 72 *Devakṛtir iti khyātam udyūnam* etc.

111 In this śloka both Br. and D have *jahnuk*, an impossible form. Brockhaus translates this perfect by „schlagen (auf ihn) zu“, hence Tawney likewise „pelted him vigorously“ (I, 37), as if it were *jaghnuk*. I read *jahruk*, this verb agrees better, I suppose, with the adjectives qualifying its subject. The bathing wives „with bodies the proportions of which were revealed by their clinging garments“ incited the mind of their husband to lovesport, *jahruk tam anganah* = „mulieres cum ceperunt“.

119 Some lines below it is related how the king was wholly abashed at the manifestation of his ignorance of Sanskrit appearing by his misunderstanding the words of the queen „*modakair deṣa paritūdaya mam*“ „The king was at once overpowered with secret shame“ (*layakranto jhatity abhūt* cf. 118). Cf. 119 thus proceeds

*parityaktajalakṛdo utadarpaṣṭva tatkṣanam*

*jātūtamūno nirlakṣaḥ prāviṣṭaḥ nyamandaram,*

so D. In Br. is edited *nirlakṣyaḥ*, LAMMAN has adopted this reading in his *Reader*, 50<sup>14</sup>. But neither *nirlakṣaḥ* nor *nirlakṣyaḥ* seem to represent the genuine word. If we admit of its correctness, we have to comply with such an *ṣ-ṣṣ* *εἰς-εἰς* as is scarcely consistent with the general laws of structure of Sanskrit words. There does not exist such a verb as *nirlakṣyati*, if it existed, it would not at any rate mean „to avoid the sight“. On the other hand, analyzing *nirlakṣya* (or *\*kṣa*) = „where the *lakṣya* is wanting“ cannot account for the translation neither of Br., who makes the king return to his palace, „um von Nienirndem gehen zu werden“, nor for that of T., who renders the conclusion of this śloka in this manner, and immediately entered his own palace *unperceived*. The simplest correction would be to change *nirlakṣaḥ* into *utalakṣaḥ*. But it

seems improbable that an as common word as *vilakṣa* should have been altered. If we correct *nīlakṣmi* all will be right. *Lakṣmi* has often the meaning of 'brilliance, lustre' in one's outer appearance (cp. Art. s. Diet, s. 2. 1°). *nīlakṣmi* is the same as the more common word *nīsprabha*. The king, being abashed and put to shame, was in low spirits and in a dejected state of mind. This he showed by his perplexed countenance. Cp. the parallel places *Divyāvadana* 633° and *Avaḍaṇaṣṭaka* I 48<sup>10</sup> where *nīspratibhāna* is used of persons, vanquished in disputation.

- 9 77 For *vipanne paṇḍage purāṇe* I read *v p purve*. The mountaineer says to Udayana: 'I am a poor man, and I always maintain myself by exhibiting snakes [*grāma bhujagam* *klēlayan sadu*]. The snake I previously had having died I finding this one captured him [*ayam mayu labdhak*] (I I 55). Now as the phrase 'the snake I previously had' corresponds to *pannagal purāṇa* not *purāṇa*, it follows that *purāṇa* is a corrupt reading and must be corrected into *purve*.
- 10 159 The hunter who finds Cridatta and tells him that his wife whom he had lost is safe and stays at Nagasthala in the house of an old brahman concludes his message with this *śloka* which is edited (in both B and D) as follows:  
*tataḥ caṣam iliyato buddha tannana tanmukhat  
 tani aneṣṭam tato gaccha cikhram Nagasthalani prati*  
 T (I 64) renders the second line thus: 'Therefore you had better go quickly to N to search for her.' But how can Cridatta be urged to search for his wife when he has been just before informed of the place where she is? The right reading is, of course, *tvan aneṣṭam* with punctuation after these words for it is *aham ilagataḥ* that has *tvan aneṣṭam* for its complement. The hunter says: 'having learnt your name from her lips I came here to search after you.' Therefore, go quickly to N.'
- 11 77 *tataḥ klēna jātisya rajnah kanya tu tanvy atla*  
 The particle *tu* is here not required and inconvenient. Correct *svatanvy atla* = 'a very delicate daughter or a beautiful daughter.'
- 13 196 Vā-avadatta leaves her uneasiness at her having left stealthily the paternal home with her lover, king Udayana,

being moved by the lovely tale narrated by Vasantaka about the adventures of the faithful wife Devasmitā. These are the contents of this śāridūlavikrīḍita stanza, the third and fourth pādas of which are thus edited

*tallajjāsadanam vidhaya vidadhe Vāseṣare bhartari  
prakṛpandhapranayūtabaddham api tad bhaktyekatanam manah*

The subject of the passive perf *vidadhe* is *Vāsavadattayā* in the second pīda 'Tawney his well 'caught, I think, the purport of the first part of pīda c), which Brockhaus must have considered so difficult as to overlook it wholly in his translation. He translates „she got over the feeling of shame [= *tallajjās vidhāya*] at having recently left her father's house [= *navaparityaakte pitur veṣmani* in pīda b)]'. Apparently he does not take *sadanam* = 'Sitz', as is done PW VII, 603 s. v. *sadana* 1), but he will claim for it the meaning 3) 'Erschlaffung', as I do. Yet, this being the case, its connection with *vidhāya* does not make a proper sense. Not *vidhāya* but *viḥāya* must be the right reading, *tallajjasadanam viḥāya* answers to Latin *hujus pudoris languore relicto*.

11, 15 The nuptials of Udayana and Vāsavadattā are come to an end, and U with his wife go back to Kauṣāmbi  
*sa prastathe tato deśya saha śrapurim prati*. After two or three days *viśayam tam avāpya sah* etc. Collect *viśayam śīlam*, for he arrived in his own territory.

100 Both B<sub>1</sub> and D have *gacchat brūṭhāṁ brūṭha*. For *brūṭha* to restore *brūṭi*, it is an imperative.

17, 72 I change *pramodena* into *pramūdēna*. Somaprabhā, that wondrous girl, who spoke immediately after birth, had told her father, he must not marry her to anybody, accordingly the father „concealed her in his house", and in this manner she grew up hidden from everybody. But, so relates our tale teller, once it happened that on the festival of spring she looked down from the top of her house. That she did so *pramūdēna* 'by some impudence (of her warden-s)' is something essential which cannot be missing, *pramodena*, which denotes that „she looked on out of gladness", is to no purpose. Even in the parallel extract in *Bīhatkathāmanjari*, however shortened, the accidental character of the fact is indicated, see p. 80, cl. 139 *tam Ṣakrotsarayaūtrayām darivādātla-ganasthitam / Guhasenasuto 'paśyat*

156

Yangandharīyana counsels his master to return to Kauṣṭhīmbī, for we know that there is nothing to be feared from the king of Māgadhā even though he has been deceived for he has been completely gained over by means of the negotiation termed 'Giving of a daughter' (I I, 123) Here the sentence he has been gained over is the translation of *samadhīta* in Bī, an impossible form explained in PW, VII 102 as *an at ap = samdhita* D reads *sa badhīta* (= he has been checked) The true reading is, of course, *sa sādīta*, that expresses nearly the same as I s he has been gained over', the whole line runs thus

21, 96

*kanyasambandhanumna hi samna samyā sa sādīta*  
It is almost superfluous to observe that the avagraha in both editions should disappear *sa rajaputro bheje*  
*parāṇa śrīyam* Cp *supra* p 92 in fine

21, 106

I read the śloka thus

*torac ca sa dūtīyo sya saklo caranukhena tat*  
*vijñāya Madhavo py evaṃ nagarīm praveśa tam*

The edited text has *tam* and *clannagarīm*

2, 88

Both Bī and D edit this śloka as follows  
*ratīa ca tatā supleṣa sarīre adhgatadhīan*  
*śrīteṣu nstīnaparānādīpīnthaśayyūnīśīre*

Here I cannot account for *adhgatadhīan* as a designation of people who have travelled the whole day and are now fatigued as is required by the context I (I, 209) translates And at night while all were asleep wearied with their long journey etc *Adhgatadhīan* does not suit this meaning it ought to denote rather one who has found his way I propose to correct *sarīre apti gatadhīan* = while all travellers without exception, were asleep *gatadhīan* is here as appropriate a word to signify people at rest after travelling as *adhīaga* and *adhīagacchan* (Jatakamālā VI 27) to signify travellers on the road

217

I think *tam* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda is to be corrected into *tat sarīraram* is a neuter always and every where Cp PW and PWK ~ v

26 112

D = 140 Br The sons of Sitāvrata, having had hold on Śaktideva, are going to make an expiatory offering of him to Durgā, since he had occasioned the death of their father They say





almost the nature of our „rather” Here are some instances 22, 84 *tad etām upasarpāmi tāvaj jṛṃṣitum varam / ity ālocya*, 26, 250 *āstām tatvaiva bhūyo ’pi pāpāḥ kāpālika varam*; = „let the wicked kāpālika rather remain there still longer”, 39, 50 (Br) *tad ihava varam devī bhugrham kriyatām it;* 101, 8 *varam Ujjayinīm yūmi tatra prāpyeta jñtu sah*, 123, 57 *tad gacchami varam pathā / etatpradaśyamānena* Other instances see PW, VI s v *varam*, 2 b

- 31, 167 I read this śloka with a slight correction, altering *layāniya* into *lasya*°

*tathā pārṣvam lasyāniya sūtām Madanamañcukām*

*Kalīngasenayū prītyā rajyamānah sa tathivān*

*Pārṣvam* cannot be destitute of the genitive depending on it

- 212 The words *yathā tatha* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda must be interchanged, the meaning being „he conducted himself in such a way [*cestate sma tathā*] that [*yathā*], though attacked by an emperor, he was not defeated” (T I, 314)

- 37, 165 Tawney translates the line *anubhūtādbhūtānekajanmāmutraiva janmani* „having endured more than one [add ‘wonderful’] birth in this very life” (I, 348) But *amutra janmani* is „in the other life”, the very counterpart of this life (*īdam janma*) Somadeva wrote, I am sure, *°janmāmūtre va janmani* = „having endured many wonderful births, as if in the other world”

- 38, 111 It is said of the heroine Madanamīla that she, having lost her sweetheart, determined to die, if in the space of six months he should not return Her temper of mind, while being in this disposition, is thus described in the edited text (Br and D)

*tatas tadviprayogārtā jṛtam viśaredanūm*

*deham nīphalamuyāsamāhāram caurayūtanūm*

*manyamāna,*

and rendered by T (I, 352) as follows „. . . afflicted at his departure, and considering life to be poisonuous, and the body, that fruitless accumulation of delusion, to be merely a punishment for thieving” We may understand that she, heavy with sorrow, looks on life as anguish caused by poison, but what in the world may account for the strange and absurd opinion, that the body

should be held for 'a punishment for thieving' ? Besides, though *māyā* (delusion) is the acknowledged cause of the phenomenal world, from the orthodox Vedantic standpoint, such a tenet as *deha* = *māyāsamāhāra* is mislead of and, if considered well, almost an impossibility for an Indian mind, the *māyā* does not consist of small particles, the sum or *saṁhāra* of which makes up a body. Brockhaus was mistaken, when he divided *nishphala māyā-samāhāram*. He ought to have divided thus *nishphalam āyasaṁ āhāram*, in three words. And as to *caurayatanām*, I am sure it repeats a misread *cara yatanām*. I restore, accordingly, Somadeva's genuine śloka in this manner

*tatas tadāpiyagūrtā jīvitam iva yatanām*

*deham nishphalam āyasaṁ āhāram cara yatanām*  
*manyamānā,*

= " considering life to be poison agony, the body  
fruitless toil and food to be a punishment "

39, 215 For *iṣṭānam yatanam buddha savakakalam* / *sambhāryanta*  
I propose *svavakakalam* / *sambhāryanta* = "guessing  
that the king was gone after knowing her false tongue",  
*buddha* has the king for its subject, not the queen. T's  
translation (I, 366) is to be corrected in this way

41, 31 King Ciraṃśu the long-lived, whose minister was the  
wise Nāgarjuna (see *supra* p 48), has anointed his  
son Jivahara *yuvārāja*. When he rejoiced at his dignity  
of crown prince, comes up to his mother she says to  
him "Why do you rejoice without cause, my son at  
having obtained this dignity of crown prince for this is  
not a step to the attainment of the kingly dignity, not  
even by the help of asceticism." For many crown princes,  
sons of your father have died, and not one of them  
has obtained the throne, they have all inherited dis-  
pointment. For Nāgarjuna has given this king an heir  
by the help of which he is now in the eighth century  
of his age." These words of the mother, which I transcribe  
from T (I, 377) = original text II, 31—33, offer no  
difficulty, but for the mention of asceticism. The life and  
the business of a crown prince are the very contrary of  
the life and the occupations of an ascetic. What, then,  
the *tapas* has to do here? Nothing at all, I think. If the  
free from co on, that *tapas* would cer-  
tain of this śloka was

almost the nature of our „rather” Here are some instances 22, 84 *tad etāṃ upasarpāmi tūcay jijñāṣitum iaram / ity ālocya*, 26, 250 *āstām tatāva bhūyo, 'pa pūpak kōpālīko iaram;* = „let the wicked kōpālīka rather remain there still longer”, 39, 50, (Br) *tad iha va iaram deṇi bhugrham kṛiyatām itī*, 101, 8 *iaram Ujjayintm yūmi tatra prāpyeta jutu sah*, 123, 57 *tad gacchami iaram pathā / etatpradarśyamāneva* Other instances see PW, VI s v *iaram*, 2 b

- 34, 167 I read this śloka with a slight correction, altering *layāniya* into *lasyā*

*tatra pārṣvam lasyāniya sutam Madanamañcukām*

*Kalingasenayā prītya iayyamānā sa tathivān*

*Pārṣvam* cannot be destitute of the genitive depending on it

- 212 The words *yatha tatha* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda must be interchanged, the meaning being „he conducted himself in such a way [*ceṣṭate sma tathā*] that [*yathā*], though attacked by an emperor, he was not defeated’ (T I, 314)

- 37, 165 Tawney translates the line *anubhūtādbhūtanekajannmā-mutrāva janmani*, having endured more than one [add ‘wonderful’] birth in this very life” (I, 343) But *amutra janmani* is „in the other life”, the very counterpart of this life (*īdam janma*) Somadeva wrote, I am sure, *°jannāmūtre va janmani* = „having endured many wonderful births, as if in the other world”

- 38, 111 It is said of the hetera Madanaināla that she, having lost her sweetheart, determined to die, if in the space of six months he should not return Her temper of mind, while being in this disposition, is thus described in the edited text (Br and D)

*tatas tadviprayogātā jvītam visāvedanūm*

*deham nīphalamāyusamāhāram caurayutanām*  
*manyamāna,*

and rendered by T (I, 352) as follows „afflicted at his departure, and considering life to be poison agony, and the body, that fruitless accumulation of delusion, to be merely a punishment for thieving” We may understand that she, heavy with sorrow, looks on life as an anguish caused by poison, but what in the world may account for the strange and absurd opinion, that the body

should be 'hold for 'a punishment for thieving'? Besides, though *māyā* (delusion) is the acknowledged cause of the phenomenal world, from the orthodox Vedantic standpoint, such a tenet as *deha* = *māyāsamāhāra* is unheard of and, if considered well, almost an impossibility for an Indian mind, the *māyā* does not consist of small particules, the sum or *samāhāra* of which makes up a body. Brockhaus was mistaken, when he divided *nishphala māyā samāhāram*. He ought to have divided thus *nishphalam āyāsam āhāram*, in three words. And as to *caurayātanaṁ*, I am sure it represents a misreid *caura yātanaṁ*. I restore, accordingly, Somadeva's genuine *śloka* in this manner:

*tatas tadāpiyogarta jvītam iva vedanām*

*deham nishphalam āyāsam āhāram caura yātanaṁ*

*manyamunā,*

= " considering life to be poison agony, the body  
fruitless toil and food to be a punishment "

39, 215 For *rajānam yatam buddhīṁ savākchalam / sambhāryana*  
I propose *svavākchalam / sambhāryana* = "guessing  
that the king was gone after knowing her false tongue",  
*buddhīṁ* has the king for its subject, not the queen. T's  
translation (I 366) is to be corrected in this way

41, 31 King Cūṭius the long lived, whose minister was the  
wise Nagarjuna (see *supra*, p. 48), has appointed his  
son Jivalīra *prajāya*. When he rejoiced at his dignity  
of crown prince, comes up to his mother she says to  
him "Why do you rejoice without cause, my son, at  
having obtained this dignity of crown prince, for this is  
not a step to the attainment of the kingly dignity, not  
even by the help of asceticism? For many crown princes,  
sons of your father have died, and not one of them  
has obtained the throne, they have all inherited dis-  
pointment. For Nagarjuna has given this king an elixir,  
by the help of which he is now in the eighth century  
of his age." These words of the mother, which I transcribe  
from T (I, 377) = original text 41, 31—33, offer no  
difficulty, but for the mention of asceticism. The life and  
the business of a crown prince are the very contrary of  
the life and the occupations of an ascetic. What, then,  
the *tapas* has to do here? Nothing at all, I think. If the  
*śloka* 31 were free from corruption, that *tapas* would  
to be I surmise, the genuine form of this *śloka* was

*yauharāṣyam idam prūpya putra hr̥gasya kim mṛṣā?*  
*rūpyapṛaptyai kramo hy eṣa na kadācana vidyate*  
 = „do not rejoice at your being anointed crown prince  
 this is *never at all* a step to the attaining of the royal  
 dignity,” नकदाचन has been depraved into तपसाचन

- 44, 57 Sūryaprabhā, the future lord of the Vidyādhara kidnaps many princesses as his wives, thanks to the favour of the Asura Maya. Roaming with his chariot through the air he took Māḍinasenā from Tāmraliptī, Candikāvatī from Aprānta, Varunasenā from Kāncī, Sulocanā from Lāvāṇika etc. From Tāmraliptī he carried away also a second princess,

*ayayan<sup>o</sup> Tāmraliptim ca punas tatropy apūharat*  
*aparām rajatanayam kanyam nāmnā Vilāsiniṃ*

Here I have corrected *apūharat* for *upāharat*, as is edited in both B<sub>1</sub> and D. Perhaps it was an error of print in Br, thoughtlessly repeated in D Cp čl 63, where the king of Tāmralipti complains to the father of Sūryaprabhā *putrena tata me 'pahrte sute* *Supra*, p. 71 we have conversely corrected *apa'* instead of *upa'*. At 48, 34 D has *upakrtam*, which is preferable to B<sub>1</sub>. *apakrtam*

Another instance of the same confusion is 75, 95. The woman says

*kim tv aham na sadā tatra gacchāmy apahr̥tāmbarā*  
*kuptrah kṛtato vastram dīpta hi harate mama*

Here Br reads *upahr̥tāmbarā*, D *upakrtāmbarā*. The fault escaped the attention of Boehtlingk, who in his *Chrestomathie*<sup>2</sup> p. 114 (čl 37) kept the reading of Br, Tawney rightly translates, as if his text had *apahr̥ta'* „but I never go at present, as I have been deprived of my clothes, for my wicked son, who is a gambler, takes away my clothes, as soon as he sees them” (II, 236)

- 45, 27 In the answer of Maya, the advocate of Sūryaprabhā, to Nārada, Indra's messenger, Br's corrupt text *yat ,prāṣamedhākaranam devājayām<sup>o</sup>” ca jalpatī | tad asat* has misled T (I, 415). D much better *ya c cāṣamedhā<sup>o</sup>*. Read *ya c cāṣamedhākaranam devājayām<sup>o</sup> ca jalpatī tad asat* = „and with regards to his (Indra's) saying about the not-performance of an aṣamedha (by us) and our contempt of the devas, that is false”

19, 175 D = 176 B. For *sāpi tanmukha eva* I think it must be put *sāpi tanmukheṇ eva*, *tanmukha eva* cannot be accounted for grammatically, neither as nom nor as loc, and cp the preceding śloka *pravrajākamukheṇa*

216 „And a wife, [says Gunnarman] who falls in love of her own accord with a man, is sure to be chaste, but if she is given away by her father against her will, she will be like *Asokavati*” (T I, 469) The original text of this sentence, whose meaning is exactly rendered by the words quoted, is thus edited

*jyā ca sārāsā iaktā bhaved avyabhicārini  
avaśā pitṛdattā ca syād Iśokavati yathā*

Here, I suppose, every Sanskritist must be at a loss how to account for *sārāsā*. That word must be somehow corrupted, and I think we do not go much amiss by conjecturing the true reading to be *avaśā*. The wife got against her will and given by her father — *avaśā pitṛdattā ca* — is contrasted with her who of her own accord comes to her husband, whom she loves — *sā-  
iaktā iaktā*

53, 10

*Labdhriddatta*, a dependent (*kārpatika*) of king *Lakṣadatta*, had received from his lord a citron filled with jewels. He, however, thinking it a common citron, sold it to some Buddhist mendicant, who visiting the king, presents him with it. *Lakṣadatta*, recognizing the fruit, asks the mendicant, how he came by it. The first line of śl 10 continues the question, Br differs here from D

Br *matulungam kuta idam samlabdham bhavatam iti*  
D *mātulungam kuta idam bhadanta bhavatam iti*

I prefer the reading of D, but as it is very improbable that the king addresses that ordinary mendicant in so respectful terms as is implied by the plural *bhavatām*, I hold this word for a corruption and conjecture

*matulungam kuta idam bhadanta bhanyatām iti*  
= „How did you come by that citron? Tell it me, reverend sir”

57, 111 foll. These two ślokas, in which the rescue of *Sundarī* from the well and the returning of her lover *Iśvaravarmān* are narrated (T II, 7), seem to be badly transmitted in ms. Partly D, partly my own conjecturing may help

to improve the reading So I think, Somadeva composed them

*utkṛpta mṛtakalpa i śi kṛtātmanas mēdite 1)*  
*pratya gate vanikputra ulupam śanakaḥ dadau ||*  
*samuṣṭastu 2) samudaya īśtas tam sunugah priyām*  
*agad Iśaiararīmsau pratyaṛtyana tadgrām ||*

62 143 Since it is impossible to construe *yuyam* since  
*ḥiṣṭantu* and no other grammatical employment of the  
 imperative is left then to be the predicate of *yuyam*,  
*tṛṣṭantu* must be a clerical error for *tṛṣṭata*

63 59 The water genius relates how he has been born as such  
 by a fault committed in a previous existence when being  
 under the vow of the *uposana* he though not purposely  
 had had sexual intercourse with his wife When this  
 vow was almost completed he says, one of my wives  
 wickedly came and slept in my bed (I II 82)  
 Then happened that which is told in 51 59 defectively edi-  
 ted in Br — one syllable is wanting — in D it is  
 as follows

*turye tu yame viṣṛtya tadrate tanniveśanam*  
*ndrumohat taya sukam ratam sevitanu alam*

It is plain that he did not forget *tanniveśanam* but *tan-  
 mēdlaan* As to the confusion in ins between *i*  
 and *d* see *supra*, p 69 at the bottom

65 81 The meaning of *upakāṣaṇa* as is edited in Br and  
 D must be a mystery to the interpreters of this passage  
 Somaprabhā has caused her brother to become a bird with  
 a golden crest, and puts the term to the cure saying

When you fall in your bird form into a blind  
 well and a certain merciful person draws you out and  
 you do him a service in return then you shall be released  
 from this curse I transcribe the words quoted from I II  
 105 and I have italicized the equivalent of *taṣya kṛtō-  
 pakāra ṣam* of the edited text to show that Tinnel  
 translated *upakāṣaṇa* as if it were simply *upakāra* I  
 surmise that the genuine reading is

*taṣya kṛtōpakāraṇi tvaṇi śepaṇi etasī tartsjasi*

67 72 Since there is no species of ruddy goose (*cahrai ika*)

) Br i vel i tam / prat / aṣṭa i van kṛ tam 1°

D i d ta u / prat / aṣṭa i va kṛ tam a°

) So D Br sa aṣṭa i



which is styled *niṣṇācalavāla*, and there is made mention in this śloka of the *cakravāla* separated from his *cakra vāla* „at night” (I II, 129), a very common simile, the edited reading need be corrected into *niṣṇā cakravāla-sadrṣi kāpy avastha mamābhavat*

- 71, 11 Migaukrānta has rescued the king of the Bhallas from the peril of drowning, whereupon that prince shows his gratitude by offering him his friendship and assistance in his undertaking, inviting him to enjoy his hospitality with these words (I II, 151) „So do me the favour my lord, of coming to my palace, since I am your slave” It is obvious that the original text of this content thus edited

*tat prasadam kuruvān gṛhaṁ bhṛtyasya me prabho*  
must be corrected into *bhṛtyasya te prabho*

- 105 In the speech, with which king Vinakara blames the inaction and the want of energy of his son Kama-līkara, an instrumental has perchance ousted the legitimate locative from its place Read the first line of the śloka thus

*traya ca dīpta nudyapi jagṛva sukhasangina*

and translate up to the present time no longing for conquest has manifested itself in you, a person addicted to pleasures’ The edited text hī-*traya* *sukhasangina* is if *dīpta* were synonymous with *darṣita*

- 71 69 I suppose *pragalbhate* to be corrupt We have to expect *pragalbhātum* The citizens thought (But) let Simira bhīti not dare to rob him of the kingdom ; The śloka, therefore, is to be corrected thus

*manasya rāgam Samābhāto kartum pragalbhātum* etc

- 11 The man who was fastidious about beds one of the three fastidious brothers, bore a red mark on his side caused by a lion that was found upon examination underneath seven mattresses This mark qualified in śl 11 *mudira kutīrūna* is again spoken of in śl 11, for not *angam*, as has been edited, but *anāgam* must be meant It is said that the king was astonished on beholding that mark

so *‘py anīlasya vīkṣya tat*

*tadṛupam tulikācāṅgasyānālam rāja vīkṣya*  
(I II, 273 translates „when the king saw the stilt of his body”) Cp Ksemendra telling the same tale IX, 2, 362

to improve the reading. So, I think, Somadeva composed them

*utkṛipta mṛtakalpam sa kṛtūlmānam unedite<sup>1)</sup>*  
*pratyāgate caṇikputra ālūpam śanaḥair dadau ||*  
*samaṣṭi astū<sup>2)</sup> samūdaya hr̥ṣṭas tum sānugah priya*  
*ṅgūd Iṣṭarararmāsau pratyūṣṭyāna tadgrham ||*

62, 143 Since it is impossible to construe *yuyā* *sa* *ti* *sthantu*, and no other grammatical employment of *t*<sup>1</sup> imperative is left than to be the predicate of *yuyā ti* *sthantu* must be a clerical error for *ti* *sthata*

63, 59 The water genius relates how he has been born as a by a fault committed in a previous existence, when he was under the vow of the *upovāsa* he, though not purposed to have sexual intercourse with his wife. „When the vow was almost completed” he says, „one of my wickedly came and slept in my bed” (T II, 1). Then happened that which is told in śl 59 defective in Br — one syllable is wanting —, in 1 as follows

*turye tu yume vismṛtya tadrate tanniveran*  
*nidrumohat taya sakam ratam sevitaran aha*

It is plain that he did not forget *tanniveranam* *niśedhanam*. As to the confusion in mss b and dh see *supra*, p. 69 at the bottom

65, 81 The meaning of *upakaramṣa*, as is edited in D must be a mystery to the interpreters of the Katha. Somaprabhā has cursed her brother to become a golden crest, and puts this term to the end

When you fall in your bird form, as well and a certain merciful person draws you to him a service in return, then you shall be free from this curse. I transcribe the words quoted in 105 and I have italicized the equivalent of *pakaramṣam* of the edited text, to show translated *upakaramṣa* as if it were simply surmise that the genuine reading is

*lasya kṛtupakāsam tiam śopam*

67, 72 Since there is no species of ruddy geese

<sup>1)</sup> Br *nucel* *sa* *tam* *pratyāgatam* *caṇikputram* *a*<sup>2)</sup>

D *nucel* *sa* *tam* *pratyāgatam* *caṇikputram* *a*<sup>2)</sup>

<sup>2)</sup> So D, Br *sa* *ti* *sthata*

which is styled *niṣucakāṇḍaka*, and there is made mention in this śloka of the *calṛaṇaka* separated from his *calṛa* *raṇi*, at night' (I II 129), a very common simile, the edited reading need be corrected into *niṣi calṛaṇa sadṛṣi kāpya māsṭha mamabharat* ;

- 71, 11 Mrgāṅkadatta has rescued the king of the Bhūllas from the peril of drowning, whereupon that prince shows his gratitude by offering him his friendship and assistance in his undertaking, inviting him to enjoy his hospitality with these words (I II, 154) "So do me the favour, my lord, of coming to my palace, since I am your slave" It is obvious that the original text of this content thus edited

*taṭ prasadam kṛtvācāhi grhaṇ bhṛtyasya me prabho*  
must be corrected into *bhṛtyasya te prabho*

- 105 In the speech with which king Vimalakīrti blames the inaction and the want of energy of his son Kāmralikārti an instrumental has perchance ousted the legitimate locative from its place Read the first line of the śloka thus

*tiyā ca dīpta nidyopī jigīṣa sukhasaṅginī*  
and translate up to the present time no longing for conquest has manifested itself in you a person addicted to pleasures" The edited text has *tiyā sukhasaṅginā*, as if *dīpta* were synonymous with *darṣita*

- 74, 69 I suppose *pragalbhatē* to be corrupt We have to expect *pragalbhatam* The citizens thought (But) let Śūmukha not dare to rob him of the kingdom, The śloka, therefore, is to be corrected thus

- 11 *māṇasya rājyam Samarabhātō tātum pragalbhatam* etc  
The man who was fastidious about beds one of the three fastidious brothers, bore a red mark on his side caused by a lion that was found upon examination underneath seven mistresses This mark qualified in śl 41 *mudreṇa kutilarūpa* is again spoken of in śl 41, for not *angam*, as has been edited but *ankam* must be meant It is said that the king was astonished on beholding that mark

so 'py anīlaya iṣṣya taṭ

*tadṛupam lūlikacangasyāṅkaṁ rājā iṣṭisṃye*  
(I II, 273 translates "when the king saw the state of his body") Cp Ksemendra telling the same tale IX, 2, 362

*ṣaṃyucango 'dhikas lebhya yo, iālen anukītas tanau* In the parallel place of the pro-ecadaction of Vetālapān caviṃṣatī edited by Jivamanda Vidyāśīgarī in 1873 (title 5, p. 27<sup>19</sup>) likewise *ṣaṃyucanēoh prāthe cihnam dīstā brute , satyam ayam ṣaṃyucanenāh*''

- 83, 30 Jivadatta, one of the suitors for the hand of Anan giratī being asked his name and his profession or art, answers

*upro 'Iam Jivadattakhyo vijñānam ca mānēdīṣam*

*jantun mrtan apy anyā darṣayamy aṣu jātāh*

So this śloka is edited. Its meaning is plain, but for *apy anyā* That T's translation (II, 276) ; I can restore to life dead creatures, and exhibit them alive is materially right is out of question. But T did as less understand the words *apy anyā* as I do. I believe they are vitiated and perhaps we would not be far from the truth, if we restored *anupranya*. The *anupranana*, in its most strict acceptance, signifies a certain ceremony in the ritual of the *jñtakarma* the object of which is to vivify the newborn child by inspiring into it successively the five different breaths which constitute life. In a figurative sense it is used in the Piabodhaeandrodya IV (p. 137 of ed. Agrivāsa 1898) *pranayamadyanuprānanena*. Here, too, the verb *anupranayati* would be apposite to express the idea of restoring to life dead people. Cp. *uṣṭasya hi prānanam jñānam tve* (RV I, 48, 10), in you (Uṣas) resides that which makes every being breathe and live.

- 91, 100 The boy of seven years who willingly offers his life to give that of the king and to relieve his poor parents says to them, when he asks their permission permit me to do so, and put an end to your poverty. (I II, 310) The Sanskrit original of this sentence is vitiated by a grammatical blunder, which I should pass over truthly, for it seems to be a simple error of print in Br if not D had the same fault. Of course, it must be

*tan m m abhyanujuntam hatān cupadam ātmanah*  
both Br and D have *hatān*

- 95, 12 *tato dhīneṣu yateṣu tikṣṇasurgarīṣu iyakān*

*prostitamān niruddhadhṛtā glāmakāla ślabhyagāt*

The adverb *īha* is out of place. This is so obvious that 'l (II, 313) omitted it in his translation unconsciously,

methinks Read *gharmakala ivabhyagat* the particle of comparison though put after *gharmakalah* logically belongs to *protonum uruddhadha*. The three following *śloka*s are built up in a similar way they are descriptive of characteristics of the hot season each trait being embellished by a comparison denoted by *iva*. This consideration favours the proposed correction.

- \* 108, 131 The spies who have visited incognito the court of the rival Viśvadhara king Mandaradeva report to Narayanaśrī the hostile intentions of that monarch and his disdainful utterance about him. On hearing this the assembly of V's partisans were all beside themselves with anger. The arms of Citrangada frequently waved and extended seemed with the tinkling of their bracelets to be demanding the signal for combat etc. (II 156). What is said here of Citrangada corresponds to this *śloka*:

*Citrangadaya bahu sa eva uttapraṣṭau punah*

*amugatum nadevan yoddhau calayantīmanah*

Anybody who reads these lines must be stricken by the impossibility of explaining *evau*. This pronoun is not only quite superfluous but is little as one would say in English. Citrangada's arms frequently waved etc. Somadeva has expressed himself in a similar way. I hold *evau* for corrupt and suggest that the good reading is *h/e*. C made strong movement with his arms in the air to give vent to his anger. A to the pictorial ground of this emendation cp 106-110 where B has *khedaśalāt* but D the right reading *śeḍacśalāt* (*supra* p 69).

- 119 140 Muktaphaḍḍhaya says to his friend that the temple of Guṇa new which they have deeded in the place where he rescued formerly his beloved Padmavati from the injury of the Rakṣas [116, 27 foll.] In his translation (II 156) his words are: Here I had my first interview with my beloved when she had been terrified by the Rakṣas etc. the original of which is

*amutra Rakṣasāstraṣṭa pūrti saribhānti mayi*

But *saribhānti mayi* cannot be the equivalent of 'I had my first interview with her' on the other hand no meaning inherent to *saribhānti* fits the situation. I think *saribhānti* is a misread *santūritā* which being restored

makes the meaning this „Here I rescued her, when she had been terrified by the Rākṣasīs ”

- 184 Padmāvatī is about to put an end to her hopeless life and deliberates, what means of suicide is the best in her case. The blazing funeral pile, which has consumed the bodies of Muktāphaladhīraja and Mahābuddhi does not like her, since „it is not fitting, that I should enter this fire and be mixed up with strange men. So in this (difficult conjuncture) hanging, which gives no trouble, is my best resource” (T II, 559). I have put within brackets two words added by the translator. The original Sanskrit śloka is thus

*parapūruṣamādhye tu praveṣtum anale 'tra me  
na yuktaṃ tad anūyāsak pāṣa evātra me gaṭik*

Should hanging be styled by that girl a manner of killing one's self „which gives no trouble”? And even if she thought so, this declaration is not the contrast of what precedes, as it ought to be, for it is *not on account of the trouble* which she fears that she is not willing to throw herself into the fire. In short, *anūyāsak* must be a corrupt reading, the genuine word hidden under the corruption is *anāsthāyāḥ*, I think. By restoring it, we get this meaning „hanging alone is the proper act for me, destitute as I am of hope ”

- 121, 148 Čakra has cursed Kāvatī and added the term of the curse. She goes back to the earth and weeping „told to Thinthākarāla the curse Indra had pronounced, together with the end he had appointed to it, and how he himself was to blame ” (T II, 579). Of the Sanskrit original of the quoted passage, as it is edited,

*ut Indraṣṭapaṣāpāntu etya saṁruḥ ṣaṣaṃsa sa  
tasmat Kāvatī Thinthākarālāya saṁvayatam,*

the last word cannot be right. Read *saṁvaya kām*, an *vyayabhāva* = „with words of blame ”

- 123, 266 B = 265 Br The wicked servant who had in vain tried to keep the lady whom he had to lead to his master for himself, and now returns to him without her, exculpates himself with a lie. He says „no sooner did she come out and was seen, than I was seized there by those other men, etc ” (T II, 607). The words quoted represent nearly the meaning of the original text, but

in the editions the conjunctions *yūvat* *tavat* have interchanged their places. It must be

*nana sã niragãd yãvad, dr̥ṣṭas tãvad aham janar̥h*

Br reads the line thus

*nana sã niragãt lãvad dr̥ṣṭã, yãvad aham janar̥h*

D as follows

*nana sa niragãt tavat dr̥ṣṭo yãvad aham janar̥h*

The meaning is, 'Before she had come out, other people saw me, those seized me and took away my mule'

124, 32 The style of the second line of this *çloka* would be much improved by correcting

*ko nãma Vikramãdityah? sa eva 'ãjñãm dadãti nah*

(B<sub>1</sub> and likewise D), into

*ko nãma Vikramãdityah sa yad ajñãm dadati nah?*

Care has been taken to offer only such emendations to the consideration of competent judges as are evident or almost evident to myself. I have avoided advancing uncertain guesses and vague conjectures. Many corrupt places are still waiting the hand that restores them to soundness, in the first place if possible, by the light of duly examined manuscripts, or this failing by critical acumen. For though, as stated before, the text has been upon the whole preserved tolerably well and *crucis interpretationis* are, therefore comparatively rare, now and then there exists a strong presumption of deprivation being the cause of our want of understanding a given passage. Among others I mention 10, 63 11 16 14, 72 16, 55 22, 115 1) 37, 102 44, 107 53 85 (tempted without success by Kern) 55, 173 57, 17 72, 69 102, 111 112, 158

In the course of these researches comparison of Somadeva's text with the *Brh̥k̥m* has sometimes proved a useful instrument in both exegetical and critical respect. I am persuaded that a thorough and close examination of both works in concordance with each other, as Mañikowski and Heikel have done already in the *Pãuritantra* portion, must bear good fruit.

I will give a fair sample of what I mean with that help. It is worth while to deal with it more fully

\*) Perhaps to read *koṇi vyāyena arjake jine\** [= *vyāyena + arjake jine*]. The reading of the editions *vyāyena arjake jine* implies an impossibility. It is inadmissible to take *arjake* (uprightness) with the meaning of *jine* 'upright'. Cf. also t 24, 79

In Somadevas t. 72 a remarkable story is told which may be called the very different Indian fashion of the legend of Daedalus and Icarus. The Sanskrit text that contains it, is edited as follows by Br

*Āsīd Mālādharo nāma puṇyam brāhmanaputrikah*  
 so 'paśyad ekadā Siddha kumāram iyoma gāminam 278  
*taṁ sparidhayaṁ trinamayān pakṣhān ābadhya pāṇīyayoh,*  
*utplutya 'utplutya gagane gaty abhyasam aśikṣata* 279  
*pratyaḥ ca taṁ kṛtsnā pariṣṛāmā apūṭhakaṁ*  
*dadarṣe sa kumāreṇa kadācid iyoma cūrinā* 280  
*, dhairya yuktāṁ pariṣṛāmyan duṣkṛtōpe 'ṛthe 'pi sodyamah*  
*, bālo 'yam anukampyo me, mama hy eṣa pariṣṛāhah,'* 281  
*iti samcītya tuskṛtena nīlā tena śaṅkātāḥ*  
*śāndhena, dīyaputro 'sāc ātmano 'nucarah kṛtāḥ* 282

Towney, since he had no other instrument for interpretation at his disposal but the text as transcribed here acquitted himself well of his task by translating it as follows

Once on a time there was a young Brahman of the name of Mālādhara he beheld one day a prince of the Siddhas flying through the air. Wishing to imitate him, he fastened to his sides wings of goss, and continually leaping up he tried to learn the art of flying in the air. And as he continued to make this useless attempt every day, he was at last seen by the prince while he was roaming through the air. And the prince thought "I ought to take pity on this boy who shews spirit in struggling earnestly to attain an impossible object, for it is my business to patronize such." Thereupon, being pleased, he took the Brahman boy, by his magic power, on his shoulder and made him one of his followers." (T II, 154)

Here is its parallel in Bṛhka p. 254

*ṣyur Maladhara nama brahmano Dakṣinopathe*  
*dadarṣa nabhasa yuntam jantū Siddhākrurakam* IX, 1, 532  
*taṁ drṣtvā talapakṣabhyam kṛtātmanam parīkṣitam*  
*ukare gamanābhyasam yadhad utsahanirbharah* 533  
*taṁ yadīcchaya gulo Bhagavān utarado Guhah*  
*taṁ drṣtvā balaḥkrpaya cakara iyomagamīnam* 534

Leaving aside a few slight differences between both narratives with Ksemendra it is not the young Siddha prince who pities the energetical fustianist man but the mighty son of Śiva himself. And considering more closely the tale told, it is much more likely that a god made him one of his followers than a simple *Siddhakararah*, who for the rest may rather represent, some young Siddha



— Kṣ names him *Siddhakumāra* — than a „prince of the Siddhas” It is now plain that Blockhuys misunderstood the word *kumārena* çl 280 It denotes not „that prince of Siddhas” but Kumāra = Gauri = Skanda, the waigod And if we compare also D’s edition of the Kathāsaritsāgara, it appears that Br in çl 282 by mistake wrote *skandhena* [T’s „upon his shoulder”] for *Skandena*, as he will have found in his MSS So it is plain that Somadeva and Kṣemendra fully agree as to the main fact, that it was Skanda who took up the undertaking brahman to his dominions and made him his follower T’s translation is to be altered accordingly

## CHAPTER IV

### METRICORUM CONSPECTUS

Somadeva was a skilled metrical man. He handles the most various metres with facility and does not seem to have had great trouble to harmonize his elocution with the severe exigencies of the different kinds of versified style. As a rule he writes with the same fluency and lucidity, whether he uses the ordinary anuṣṭubh śloka or composes gīṭhāṃ and gaṇadhikāṇḍita stanzas. It is the old custom of Indian ritual narrative poetry to change the metre in the last verses of the cantos. Somadeva, who in accordance with his predecessor Ksemendra composed the bulk of his poem in ordinary ślokas and made that metre the main metrical form of each of the 124 *tarangas* of his *sigara* of tales — the popular style and the literary character of the fairy stories being little adapted to more severe and more refined metrical schemes for the composition of whole cantos as is the case in the Buddhacarita and the classical epics of Kālidāsa, Viṅḍya and others — affords a comparatively large room to that metrical variety of the conclusions. In the first lambāka he observed some restraint but gradually he must have allowed himself to indulge freely into his talent of displaying the richness of his descriptive and representing power in an elegant variety of metres. He does so especially in the last canto of each lambāka. The ninth lambāka ends with thirteen, the seventh with thirty-four, the long-twelfth even with forty-nine such free stanzas.

As I am not aware of a conspectus metrorum of the Kathaśaritaṣaṭṭakā already existing and this may be a useful instrument for further research I subjoin it here in the way of an appendix to these Studies <sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> I follow D's text for the numbers of the verses in each taranga. Those of Br agree with them if the contrary is not stated.

## CANACCHANDAS

*Arya a) pathya*

1 63—65 3 64 75—78 4 135 8 35—37 11 81—83  
 12, 193 11 85 16 122 18 406 21 147 22 255—258 23  
 91 21 230 25 292 293 26 91 273—278 (271—276<sup>b</sup>) 286  
 (281) 27 211 31 251 252 265 35 163 164 36 135 37  
 235 239 244 38 156 157 39 246 13 245 252<sup>\*</sup>) 258  
 259 262 41 140 186 (187) 15 370 371 50 207 (208)  
 210 (211) 51 220—225 52 405 406 53 32 194 51 210  
 55 235—237 239 56 338 (339) repeated 358 (359) 417—419  
 (118—120) 121—123 (122—124) 58 141 59 171 61 329  
 61 162 163 65 255 256 66 192 67 114 68 72 73  
 70 131 71 70 repeated 99 304 71 326 66 11 77 93—95  
 80 51 82 48 49 51 52 83 62—67 86 164—170<sup>\*\*</sup>)  
 88 57—60 89 115 90 201—206 93 109 95 92 93 96  
 15—50 98 32 99 11—47 100 44 18 101 374 375 385  
 103 212 (211) 101 218 (219) 107 139 110 145 (110) 111  
 104 112 214 113 95 116 95 118 193 104 119 193 204  
 11 214 215 218 121 277 278 122 103 104 110 111  
 123 339 (338) 121 58 Amount 176 stanzas

\* In D with Br the stanza is a g t but is real ng bad

\*\* Vs 168 I follow Br whose read n<sup>r</sup> I prefer in D that stanza is a g t

*b) giti*

23 89 90 21 53 231 25 297 26 146 (114) 117 (115)  
 271 (269) 272 (270) 284 (282) 31 254 33 11 61 15  
 223 43 212—244 246—251 253—255 260 261 263—268  
 11 139 382—412 50 203 (204) 201 (205) 211 (21) 51  
 227 52 110 56 360 (361) 57 175 177 59 118 119 60  
 254 (255) 66 193 67 115 69 183 78 90—12) 81 111  
 115 85 10 85 39 87 60 92 82 83 95 14—96 99 39  
 13 57 58 100 58 101 392 103 218 (217)—221 (220) 213  
 (242)—245 (214) 101 219 (220) 105 88 89 106 186 107  
 135—138 108 207 (206) 109 116—118 110 111 (115) 146  
 (147)—118 (119) 111 106 115 208—211 111 111—114  
 116 91 117 65 66 175—181 119 191 199—202 219  
 121 279 123 344 (313) 315 (311) 191 211 (212)—216 (217)

Amount 162 stanzas

\*) Vs 4 is corrupt in D Br's text has here the right read n<sup>r</sup>

) The bracketed ciphers mark the numbers of the verse in Ir  
 ) The c three g t's are also d t u a h e d by the r e l e v a n t inner rh me

a

## MĀTRACCHANDAS

*Vaitāliya* 43, 257 56, 114, 415 (415, 416) 103, 215 (214)  
Amount 4 stanzas

*tupacchandasika*

Somadēva has these three types

a) each pāda begins by √—

3, 79 4, 137 7, 112 10, 216 14, 90 32, 191, 195 (195,  
196) 38, 160 45, 372 56, 120 (421) 57, 174 62, 236 237  
61, 164 72, 405 92, 87 101, 389, 390 103, 201 (200)—209  
(208) 211\*) 106, 185<sup>1</sup> 112, 212 116, 91, 92 117, 171—174  
Amount 36 stanzas

\*) In Br, owing to a various reading vs 211 belongs to the type b)

b) each pāda begins by √—√—

2, 82 14, 89 16, 123 20, 227 21, 145 25, 298 26, 270  
(268) 34, 256 36, 133 59, 167 73, 440 102, 153 103, 210  
(209) 109, 149, 150 116, 93 123, 340 (339) Amount 17 stanzas

c) both types mixed

31, 261 262 53, 197 72, 406 95, 97 99, 42 100, 59  
103, 215 (214) Amount 8 stanzas In all of them one pāda  
begins √—√—, the other three √—

## VṚTTAM

*Amṣṭubh* I a) *indravajrā* 32, 192 (193) 45 375—377, 379  
48, 123, 125, 126 128, 150 59, 168, 169, 171,  
175 72, 407 76, 42 88, 61 92, 84 86 99, 48—  
50 52, 53, 55 103, 237 (236) 119, 198 Amount  
27 stanzas

b) *upendravajra* 31, 257 101, 380 103, 232 (231),  
235 (234) Amount 4 stanzas

c) *upajati* 4, 136 12, 195 25, 291 29, 198 199  
45, 369, 378, 380, 381 48, 121, 122 124 127,  
129—135 49, 219 (201) 250 (252) 50, 208 (209),  
209 (210) 58, 139 59, 170 90, 207 92, 85 96 51  
99, 51, 54, 56 101, 376—379, 386 103, 198—200  
(197—199), 213 (212) 231 (230), 233 (232), 234  
(233), 236 (235) 118, 195 119, 207, 209, 210 123,  
311 (310), 342 (341) Amount 51 stanza

d) *śālini* 18, 107 25, 295 36, 131 37, 241 53,  
195 81, 68 99, 16 (cp *supra*, p 138) 101, 391  
110, 113 (114) Amount 9 stanzas

e) *rathoddhatā* 8, 38 15, 148 38, 159 45, 365—

367 46 249 70 130 119 194 195 Amount 10 stanzas

f) *svagata* 40 116 Amount 1 stanza

Jagati II a) *vañçastha* 12 194 13 19, 32 193 (194) 34 219 38 158 50 206 (207) 53 196 54 241 58 140 59 176—178 101 382 383 103 197 (196) 212 (211) 222 (221) 223 (222) 225—230 (221—229) 106 183 119 197 122 112 Amount 27 stanzas

b) *indravajçe* 119 205 206 216 Amount 3 stanzas

c) mixture of a) and b) 20 22, 101 381 Amount 2 stanzas

d) *dīvataślambita* 119 208 Amount 1 stanza

Fustubh and jagati mixed One stanza 103 230 (221)

Atyagati III *praharṣini* 79 50 86 171 Amount 2 stanzas

Çakvāṁ IV *vasantīlaka* 1 60 2 83 5 141 6 166 7 111 113 13 194 15 149 16 121 17 170 18 100 20 226 228—230 21 246 23 57 88 92 93 21 229 (228) 2, 200 26 282 (280) 283 (281) 287 (280) 285 (286) 27 208—210 28 193 29 196 137 30 142 143 31 95 96 32 191 (192) 196 (197) 33 217 31 248 200 203 205 200 260 261 35 159—162 37 212 213 38 161 39 247 41 60 42 221 43 275 46 246 217 48 119 120 49 247 (249) 248 (250) 202 (204) 50 205 (200\*) 212 (213) 52 409 51 239 53 238 56 410 (413) 113 (414) 124 (425) 57 176 59 112 60 203 (204) 61 330 66 188 189 67 113 69 184 185 71 305 73 441 90 199 99 10 40 101 354 387 388 103 217 (216) 224 (223) 238—241 (237—240) 100 90 91 106 181 182 184 108 200 (205) 109 151 110 111 (142) 142 (143) 118 (149) 111 100 112 213 113 99 114 140 115 150 106 117 182 118 197 119 192 203 213 120 133 121 270 276 123 343 (342) 121 217 (218) 248 (249) Amount 122 stanzas

\*) defect e n Br

Atyākavāṁ V *nīlīni* 2 81 5 140 6 160 22 209 26 279—281 (277—279) 29 191 19, 33 216 31 217 16 248 47 121 48 138 49 201 (203) 67 112 74 320 98 75 110 138 (139) Amount 19 stanzas

Atjastā VI a) *çetāṭarini* 9 90 10 217 17 171 22 201 37

240 40, 116 41, 184 (185) 45, 368 102, 152  
Amount 9 stanzas

b) *prithu* 19, 118 21, 148 28, 189 190 30, 144  
31, 258 41, 167 (189) 15, 364, 413 47, 120 52,  
408 51, 236 53, 233 234 69, 182 70, 132 100, 57  
109 152 113, 100 118, 196 Amount 20 stanzas

c) *mandākrantā* 23, 91 26, 285 (283) 42, 225  
64, 161 66, 190 110, 140 (141) Amount 6 stanzas

Atidhr̥t̥ VII *ṣardūlavikr̥dita* 6, 167 13, 196 21, 228<sup>1)</sup>  
(227), 232 (231) 25, 290, 294 26, 289 (287) 28,  
191, 192 43, 256 44, 159, 160, 185 (186) 45, 373,  
374 48, 137 52, 407 56, 416 (417) 59, 31 63, 195  
66 191 71, 303 75, 196<sup>1)</sup> 78, 132 -83, 39-91, 61  
91, 137 97, 46 99, 11 103, 214 (213) 101, 217  
(218) 108, 208 (207) 110, 139 (110) 119, 196, 212,  
217 120, 132 121, 280 124, 249 (250), 250 (251)  
Amount 40 stanzas

Prakṛt̥ VIII *śiagdhara* 21, 233 (232) One stanza

Moreover there are two stanzas in Pākṛit̥ 55, 125 and 126 They are composed in āryā metre The second is a *giti* it is uncertain to what variety the first belongs, owing to the uncertainty of the text

The total sum of these variously versified stanzas is 761 All other verses are anuṣṭubh ślokas As the whole number of the verses of the Kathasaritsāgara is 21388, it appears that about  $3\frac{1}{2}\%$  of them are composed in other metres than the ordinary epic śloka As a rule the artful versification displays itself at the end of the *ṭarāṅga*s, but now and then such stanzas are met with amid the anuṣṭubhs, the course of which they underbreak, yet this is done sparingly and always for some good reason,

The list of the metres used shows also that the poet betrays his moderateness in this as he does in other respects Though he was able to give samples of a greater metrical richness and variety, he limited himself to the most frequent types He had apparently a predilection for the *giti* form of the *ārya* and for the *rasaśatīlaka*, the latter of which he likes to employ for resuming the result of the events narrated on the *monale de la fable* his use of *ṣardūlavikr̥dita* and *prithu* is also relatively frequent He must have avoided the *śiagdhara*, employed but once, and the *harinī*, of which no instance at all is met with in his poem

<sup>1)</sup> It is much for the credit of their author, that this stanza and the five next to it, each being the last of a *ṭarāṅga*, are *ṣardūlavikr̥dita*s of quite the same content but of various expression, built as easily and fluently as ever

# Index of notable Sanskrit words

As the words making up the list of p 76—87 are put  
in alphabetical order they are not included here

		page		page
<i>anaya</i>	22	32	<i>nibhalayati</i>	129
<i>apalapana</i>		53	<i>niyama</i>	100
<i>°apasada</i>		161	<i>nirakṣmi</i>	156 157
<i>aśakṣa</i>		73	<i>nīpratibhāna</i>	157
<i>aśraya</i>		53	<i>pathas</i>	111
<i>utphalati</i>		144	<i>pratatalkho (Pūṣṭi)</i>	30
<i>udghata</i>		131	<i>prātana</i>	53
<i>upakṣāṭya</i> etc, confound ded with <i>upakṣāṇ°</i>		160	<i>blāṣa</i>	9
root <i>ubh</i>		77	<i>maida</i>	104
<i>auṣṭya</i>	22	31	<i>maida</i>	147
<i>kāniratha</i>		137	<i>Maṣa</i>	37
<i>kalatra</i>	53	note	<i>Mikṣaropya</i>	17 18
<i>kāyamaṣa</i>		23	<i>mrkṣakṣas</i>	66
<i>kālapaṣa</i>		126	<i>mācaka</i>	
<i>gaganangana</i>		115	<i>yad astu</i>	
<i>gātadhran</i>		159	<i>yad bhavatu</i>	66
<i>galla (= ganda)</i>		128	<i>yad bhavatu</i>	
<i>ghuka</i>		26	<i>yad vultattim</i>	53
<i>ciranti (= enayanti)</i>		50	<i>riddhaka</i>	55
<i>chuyāṇṭiya</i>		39	<i>rūpaka</i>	
<i>°juni</i>		129	<i>lambaka</i>	11 59
<i>tumbula</i>		49	<i>lambhaka</i>	
<i>dimura</i>		55	<i>aram used as a particle</i>	161 162
<i>drḍḍayati — drḍḍayati</i>		88	<i>°iega Names ending in —</i>	108
<i>°drḍḍan</i>		69	<i>śatāṭṭāyaka</i>	10
<i>na param</i>	<i>gat</i>	73	<i>śabral māc im</i>	72 note 110
<i>na vult sma</i>		110	<i>samaya</i>	100
<i>nangvī anarṭata</i>		110	<i>sammada</i>	102
			<i>Sakṣi uat</i>	20
			<i>heruki</i>	66

index of passages quoted from other Sānskrit texts than  
Kathāsaritsāgara and Bṛhatkathāmañjarī

	page
Avadānaçataka	1, 48 <sup>10</sup> ..... 157
	189 <sup>7</sup> ..... 87
	228 <sup>15</sup> ..... 85
Kṣemendra: <i>Aucilyavieṇāracarcā</i> cl. 7..... 23 note	
The (Pāli) Jātaka	1, 266 <sup>14</sup> ..... 87
Jātakamālā	VI, 27..... 159
	p. 221 <sup>15</sup> ..... 132
Āntrākhyāyika	1, 56..... 51
(ed. Hertel)	
Ḍaçakumāracarita	Uttarakh., IV <sup>th</sup> Uccv..... 161
Divyāvadāna	p. 633 <sup>25</sup> ..... 157
Ḍāṇini	III, 2, 13..... 78
Prabodhacandrodaya	V, st. 28..... 88
Mudrārākṣasa	I, st. 15 *..... 54 n.
	III, at the beginning..... 137
	IV, p. 179 (ed. Trimbak Telang)..... 51
	bharatavākya..... 52, 53
	1, 63, 4  ..... 77
	IV, 1, 15  ..... 77
	IV, 19, 4  ..... 77
Varāhamihira: <i>Yogayātrā</i> 7, 14 <sup>28</sup> ..... 65	
Ślokasamgraha of the Bṛhatkathā,	41—43
and judgment about it.	and
	56—59

The asterisks point out places critically treated